DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 564 UD 020 579

AUTHOR	Baltzell, D. Catherine, Ed.; Ames, Richard, Ed.
TITLE	ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study. Results of First Year Implementation, Part 2.
INSTITUTION	Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Educational Equity Group.
REPORT NO	AAI-79-43
PUB DATE	Apr 79
CONTRACT	400-75-0074
NOTE	225p.; Some tables may be marginally legible due to small print. For related documents see UD 020 578-580.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education; *Educational Economics; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; Financial Policy; Financial Support; Program Costs; *Program Implementation; *Resource Allocation
IDENTIFIERS	Arizona (Mesa); California (Alum Rock); Colorado (Adams County); *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Massachusetts (Boston); New Mexico (Santa Fe); New York (Yonkers); North Carolina (Charlotte); North Carolina (Winston Salem); Rhode Island (Newport); Texas (Houston); West Virginia (Berkeley County); West Virginia (Harrison County); Wisconsin (Racine)

ABSTRACT

This volume attempts to identify and describe factors that supported the unexpected expansion of Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I services in thirteen participating local education agencies (LEAs). It also describes changes in program delivery patterns that may not have supported expansion of services but may have accompanied allocation policy change, and describes selected problems and successes faced by the individual districts as they conducted their programs. Increases in services received by students were attributed by the investigators to changes in the total availability of Title I funds, shifting of resources to elementary instruction, shifts in uses of funds within elementary instruction, and changes in the availability of donated resources. On the program delivery level, the investigators found that LEAs focused more on elementary instruction, modified coordination with other compensatory programs, changed staffing patterns, and increased specialist utilization and class size. Experiences of the LEAs in implementing allocation policy are described, with focus on the problems associated with changing from poverty to achievement criteria in the allocation of Title I resources, issues of service delivery, and parent involvement and reaction to allocation policy changes. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MAY 6 - 1980

ED186564

ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study

Results of First Year Implementation
Part 2

UD020579

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Abt Associates Inc. 55 Wheeler Street Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

ABT ASSOCIATES INC.
55 WHEELER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138
TELEPHONE • AREA 617-492-7100
TELEX 710 320 6367

Report No. AAI-79-43

Contract No. NIE-400-75-0074

ESEA TITLE I ALLOCATION POLICY: DEMONSTRATION STUDY

Results of First Year Implementation

PART II

April 1979,

Editors:

D. Catherine Baltzell
Richard Ames

Prepared For

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
Educational Equity Group
1200 19th Street, N.W. Room 808
Washington, D.C. 20208

Contract Manager	Quality Control Reviewer	Management Reviewer
Mary L. Ames	Claudia Buckley	WENDY PERSCHBT

MAY 1 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	PREFACE	ix
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Objectives of Volume II	1
	1.2 Organization of Volume II	3
2.0	CHANGES IN AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES TO TITLE I PROGRAMS	5
	2.1 Changes in Title I Expenditures for Elementary Instruction	8
	2.2 Changes in the Composition of Elementary Title I Program Costs	20
	2.3 Costs Per Student and Per Student FTE	29
	2.4 Summary	31
3.0	PROGRAM DELIVERY	35
	3.1 Changes in the Scope of Services and Activities	37
	3.2 Changes in Staffing Patterns	43
	3.3 Changes in Program Operations	61
	3.4 Individualization of Instruction	68
	3.5 Coordination of Compensatory Programs	77
	3.6 Summary	82
4.0	IMPLEMENTATION	85
	4.1 Testing Issues	87
	4.2 Supplement-Supplant-Scheduling	98
	4.3 Political Impact of the Demonstration on Various Constituencies	106

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	COMPARISON OF DATA SOURCES FOR TITLE I SERVICES	115
APPENDIX B:	INCREASE IN TITLE I EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION ATTRIBUTED TO ALLOCATION CHANGE, CHANGE IN CARRY-OVER USAGE, AND REDISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES WITHIN TITLE I	123
APPENDIX C:	TABLES SUPPORTING CHAPTER 3, PROGRAM DELIVERY	125
APPENDIX D:	DISTRICT SUMMARIES	169

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 CHANGES IN AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES TO TITLE I PROGRAMS

2.1 Changes in Elementary Title I Students and Student Services 1975-76 to 1976-77. . . 7
2.2 Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Title I Expenditures for Elementary Instruction. . . 9
2.3 Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Total Title I Expenditures 12
2.4 Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Title I Allocations. 14
2.5 Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Carry-Over Usage 15
2.6 Comparison of Title I Non-Elementary Instruction Expenditures in 1975-76 and 1977 17
2.7 Percent Increase in Title I Expenditures for Elementary Instruction Attributable to Change in Allocation, Carry-Over Usage, and Redistribution of Resources. 19
2.8 Distribution of Title I Expenditures for Elementary Instruction (Personnel, Non-Personnel) 1975-76 and 1976-77 22
2.9 Distribution of Title I Expenditures for Elementary Instruction (Administration, Instruction, Other) 1975-76 and 1976-77. . . 23
2.10 Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Elemtary Title I Expenditures and Estimated Total Costs. 26
2.11 Contribution of Donated Resources. 28
2.12 Title I Expenditures and Estimated Total Costs per Elementary Student 30
2.13 Title I Expenditures and Estimated Total Costs Per Elementary Student FTE 32

3.0 PROGRAM DELIVERY

3.1 Program Delivery Instrumentation and Respondent Groups. 38
3.2 Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Grade Level Coverage of Major Title I Instructional Activities for the 13 Demonstration Sites. 39
3.3 Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Percent of Title I Funds Expended by Major Activity 41
3.4 Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Percent of Title I Elementary Instructional Funds Expended by Subject Area 42

LIST OF TABLES

(continued)

		Page
3.0	PROGRAM DELIVERY, continued	
3.5	Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Number of FTE Staff Serving the Total Title I Program	45
3.6	Change From 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Elementary Staffing by Personnel Type	48
3.7	Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Elementary FTE Student/Instructional Personnel Ratio	50
3.8	Change from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Elementary Specialist/Total Instructional Personnel Ratio	52
3.9	Change from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Direct Hours of Instruction Provided by Language Arts Specialists	53
3.10	Changes in Mean Years of Teaching Experience for Compensatory Specialists and Classroom Teachers from 1975-76 to 1976-77	55
3.11	Change from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Level of Education for Compensatory Specialists and Classroom Teachers	57
3.12	Change from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Percentage of Schools that Provide Compensatory Staff Training Sessions, and Type of Persons Initiating These Sessions	58
3.13	Change from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Percentage of Schools Offering Compensatory Education Projects in Which Teachers Participated in a Variety of Other School-Initiated Staff Development Activities by District	60
3.14	Percent Change from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Language Arts Class Size	64
3.15	Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Title I Language Arts Scheduling Variables	67
3.16	Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Mean Score of Compensatory Education Language Arts Specialists on the Individually Prescribed Activities and Materials Scale	70
3.17	Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Mean Score of Regular Education Language Arts Instructors of Title I Students on the Individually Prescribed Activities and Materials Scale	72
3.18	Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Dimensions Characterizing Individualization of Instruction in Compensatory Education Language Arts Programs	74

LIST OF TABLES

(concluded)

Page

3.0 PROGRAM DELIVERY, continued

3.19 Models of Program Coordination. 78
3.20 Comparison of Changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in Services and in Expenditures for Title I Elementary Instruction. 83

4.0 IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Policy Preferences for Various Constituent Groups Potentially Affected by the Demonstration 109

APPENDICES

PREFACE

The Compensatory Education Demonstration Projects are a three-year study of the effects of changes in the procedures by which ESEA Title I funds are allocated at the intra-district level. Thirteen Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are cooperating with the National Institute of Education (NIE), the sponsoring agency, and Abt Associates Inc. (AAI), the research contractor, in this research. During 1975-76 these school districts conducted their Title I programs under current federal Title I guidelines. For 1976-77 and 1977-78 certain aspects of these guidelines were waived, and a number of unique and policy-relevant alternatives have been implemented by the LEAs involved in the Demonstration.

This report serves as a companion to Part I of the first-year implementation analysis.* Part I describes the allocation policy changes made by the 13 Demonstration LEAs and the impact of these changes upon student characteristics and experiences. The results of the analyses reported in Part I indicate that districts substantially increased the number of students served without a similar decrease in services. In other words, there was an expansion of Title I services under the Demonstration.

Part II has three basic objectives. First, it attempts to identify and describe those factors which supported this expansion of services. Two major types of changes are considered as factors supporting expansion. These are changes in resources available to the school districts and changes in program delivery patterns that facilitated the utilization of available resources. Second, Part II describes other changes in program delivery patterns which may not necessarily have supported the expansion of services, but may have accompanied allocation policy change. Third, Volume II describes selected problems and successes faced by individual districts as they conducted their Demonstration projects.

In addition to the editors, who shared overall responsibility for coordinating the preparation of this document, several individuals have made significant contributions.

Chapter 1, Introduction, was written by Ms. Nancy L. Ames. Chapter 2, Changes in Availability of Resources

---

*James Vanecko, Francis Archambault, Nancy Ames, et al., ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Results of First Year Implementation, Part I (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., March 30, 1978).

to Title I Programs, was written by Ms. Jane H. Sjogren and Mr. Richard Ames. Chapter 3, Program Delivery, was written primarily by Dr. Baltzell and Mr. Ames.

Significant contributions to both the data management and writing of Chapter 3 were provided by Ms. Jaime Grubin, Ms. Rosamund Ladner, and Mr. Ennio Mingolla. Additional data management and data processing support was provided by Ms. Ellie Lee and Mr. David Poppe.

Chapter 4, Implementation, was written by Ms. Nancy Brigham. Ms. Ames provided valuable overall support both conceptually and editorially.

Special recognition is also due Ms. Susan Klie for typing and coordinating the many drafts of this report. Her cheerful response to the many demands is greatly appreciated, along with the valuable contributions of secretaries Ms. Mary-Ellen Perry and Ms. Claudia Kelly. Ms. Kelly was invaluable in providing editorial support and assistance.

Finally, Mr. David Budding, in his role as internal reviewer, provided extremely helpful commentary and suggestions for the volume as a whole.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives of Volume II

Volume I of this report describes the allocation policy changes made by the 13 school districts which are involved in the three-year Demonstration Compensatory Education Study.* These 13 districts were granted special permission from the Commissioner of Education to establish "working models" of the Title I allocation changes considered by Congress during deliberation of the Education Amendments of 1974. The Demonstration Study, which is one component of the National Institute of Education's Compensatory Education Study, was designed to produce evidence about the practical consequences of these intra-district allocation changes.

The impact of these allocation policy changes upon student characteristics and experiences are also included in Volume I. The report analyzes differences between the 1975-76 school year, during which the districts continued to allocate Title I funds on the same basis as before, and the 1976-77 school year, during which they were granted waivers to implement change. The findings indicate that the allocation policy options adopted by the districts resulted in small changes in the characteristics of the students served. Generally, there was a slight increase in the proportion of low-achieving students served and a slight decrease in the proportion of poor students, the latter being fairly consistent across districts. Change in the proportion of minority students was relatively small and variable in direction.

---

*See Demonstration Studies of Funds Allocation within Districts (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September 30, 1977). See also James Vanecko, Francis X. Archambault, Nancy L. Ames, et al., ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Results of First Year Implementation, Volume I (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., March, 1978).

Changes in services received by Title I students were generally similar across the 13 districts. In general, there was a small decrease in the amount of time that Title I students received compensatory language arts instruction, while there was a larger increase in the amount of time that Title I students received regular language arts instruction. Further, the nature of instruction did not change as a result of the Demonstration, and the time lost in compensatory language arts (14%) was relatively small in comparison to the increase in number of students served (71%).

One of the basic assumptions underlying the Demonstration Study was that participating districts would receive no additional funds in order to implement their alternative intra-district allocation strategies. Thus, it was somewhat surprising to find that districts could have increased the number of students served so greatly, without a concomitant decrease in the services received by each student.

Volume II of this report has three basic objectives. First, it attempts to identify and describe those factors which supported this unexpected expansion of Title I services. Two major types of changes are considered:

- Changes in resources available to the school districts; and
- Changes in program delivery patterns that facilitated the utilization of available resources.

Secondly, this volume describes other changes in program delivery patterns which may not necessarily have supported the expansion of services but may have accompanied allocation policy change. In a sense, these data are designed

to mirror the first year report, describing changes from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in various aspects of program design and operations.*

In addition to changes in program resources and delivery patterns, the experiences of the districts in planning and implementing their various allocation policy changes serve to increase an understanding of several key policy issues. Therefore, a third objective of Volume II is to describe selected problems and successes faced by the individual districts as they conducted their Demonstration projects.

1.2 Organization of Volume II

Chapter 2 of Volume II examines the fiscal factors which may have allowed the expansion of Title I service. Since none of the districts received additional funding to implement their allocation strategies, the focus of Chapter 2 is on three exploratory questions related to changes in dollar resources:

- Did Title I expenditures at the elementary level increase? If so, how was that increase supported?
- Did the composition of elementary Title I program costs change as the LEAs expanded service?
- Did the unit cost of service change?

Chapter 3 examines changes in program delivery which may have facilitated the expansion of services or accompanied various allocation policy changes. Several

---

*See James J. Vanecko, Francis X. Archambault, Nancy L. Ames, et al., ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Analysis of Baseline Data, Volumes I and II (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., October 31, 1977).

different types of changes are discussed and explored. The general areas of interest are:

- the scope of activities and grade spans served;
- staffing patterns and utilization;
- program operations;
- individualization of instruction; and
- the nature and degree of coordination between Title I and other compensatory programs.

Together, Chapters 2 and 3 address the central paradox of the Demonstration, i.e., the expansion of services by districts which did not (in general) receive increased allocations or additional resources. The purpose of Chapter 4 is to examine, from the perspective of the implementing districts, the problems and issues they encountered in expanding services and making other allocation policy changes. Chapter 4 attempts to place the district experiences into a policy framework related to certain key issues. Among these are:

- the use of achievement vs. poverty criteria in determining school eligibility for Title I;
- the problem of supplementing vs. supplanting regular school programs; and
- parent involvement in and reaction to Demonstration-related changes.

2.0 CHANGES IN AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES TO TITLE I PROGRAMS

As described in Chapter 1.0, the Demonstration districts succeeded in expanding the number of students served substantially during the first implementation year without markedly reducing the amount of service received by the average student on a typical school day. Yet the Demonstration districts had not anticipated receiving additional funding for their Title I programs as they changed their intra-district Title I allocation procedures. Thus, the overall increase in service (based on number of students x service per student) was somewhat surprising.

This chapter traces the fiscal factors supporting that increase. Specifically, it addresses three questions:

- Did Title I expenditures at the elementary level increase? If so, how was that increase supported?
- Did the composition of elementary Title I program costs change as the LEAs expanded service?
- Did the unit cost of service change?

We begin by reexamining the service data.

Volume I of this report describes in some detail the changes made by the districts in schools and students served, as well as changes in the amount and quality of service per student. Student counts for that volume were primarily based on end-of-year district reports, unconfirmed by later site visits. Service estimates were obtained through administration of a Classroom Activities Log (CAL) on which teachers were asked to record students' instructional experiences at 10-minute intervals throughout the school day. Sample students were observed on two random days each, with service estimates per day based on the average of the two records wherever possible.

Further analysis of the change in overall service, based on data obtained for the cost study of the Demonstration research substantiates the earlier data in large measure. Some changes in the numbers of students served, particularly per program component, were identified through follow-up interviews on-site. Additionally, differences in service estimates were found, partly due to the fact that the cost estimates incorporate changes in the days per week and weeks per year instruction is delivered to individual students. Given that the service measures do not differ markedly and that the cost study estimates are based on updated student counts and include program duration (e.g., days per week and weeks per year of instruction), we have chosen to use these data in the discussions which follow.* We, therefore, present here a summary of these revised service estimates.

Table 2.1 presents cost study data on the numbers of elementary students served, service per elementary student, and total elementary service delivered. As can be seen, all but one of the 12 Demonstrations LEAs--Houston--for which data were available increased the number of elementary students receiving Title I instruction between 1975-76 and 1976-77. While there was a great deal of variation among LEAs, the mean increase was quite large (74%).

In contrast to the large increase in students served, instructional service per student did not decline

---

*Appendix A provides a detailed analysis of the differences in the service data obtained from the CAL and cost study approaches. It also provides a fuller discussion of the rationale for using the latter in this report.

TABLE 2.1

CHANGES IN ELEMENTARY TITLE I STUDENTS AND STUDENT SERVICES

1975-76 TO 1976-77

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	TITLE I ELEMENTARY STUDENTS[1]			SERVICE PER ELEMENTARY STUDENT[3]			TOTAL ELEMENTARY SERVICE (TOTAL STUDENT FTE)		
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76	1976-77	Proportional Change (in %)	1975-76	1976-77	Proportional Change (in %)	1975-76 (a x d)	1976-77 (b x c)	Proportional Change (in %)
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools									
Adams County #12	216	784	263%	.047	.061	30%	10.2	47.8	369%
Harrison County	1,429	1,884	32	.054	.062	15	77.2	116.8	51
Mesa	2,494	3,289	32	.038	.032	-16	94.8	105.2	11
Newport	205	453	121	.091	.077	-15	18.7	34.9	87
Racine	600	1,264	111	.132	.073	-45	79.2	92.3	17
Santa Fe	848	1,329	57	.093	.073	-22	78.9	97.0	23
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries									
Charlotte	6,578	7,266	10	.111	.121	9	730.2	879.2	20
Winston-Salem	1,833	3,205	75	.138	.148	7	253.0	474.3	87
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty									
Berkeley County	930	1,396	50	.051	.049	-4	47.4	68.4	44
Boston	10,165	11,243	11	.165	.132	-20	1,677.2	1,484.1	-12
Houston	25,502	23,200	-9	.100	.099	-1	2,550.2	2,296.8	-10
Districts making primarily intra-school changes									
Alum Rock	5,288[2]	12,382[2]	134	.447	.290	-35	2,363.7	3,590.8	52
Yonkers[4]	2,375	--	--	.107	--	--	254.1	--	--
AVERAGE	--	--	74%	--	--	-8.1%	--	--	61.6%

[1] Numbers of students served is a fully duplicated count obtained by summing the number of students served in each component of the Title I programs. In certain cases it differs from those reported by NIE, whose counts were unduplicated.

[2] Includes grades 1-8.

[3] Defined as a student full-time equivalent (FTE), this measure represents the "average" proportion of a Title I student's year spent in Title I instruction.

[4] Information about student services for 1976-77 is not available from the Yonkers school district at this time. Averages are calculated without Yonkers.

greatly.* As Table 2.1 shows, the amount of time an "average" Title I elementary student received Title I instruction during the regular academic year decreased in eight of the LEAs and increased in four. The average decrease was 20%; the average increase was 15%. Across all districts, the average decrease in service per elementary student was only 8%.

The total amount of service delivered by the Demonstration districts increased substantially. While there was a wide range in the proportional change among districts, the mean change was substantial (62%). In one district--Adams County #12--the proportional change exceeded 100%.

To summarize, for the Demonstration districts as a group we see a mean increase of 74% in the number of elementary students served during the first implementation year. This increase is accompanied by a very small mean decrease of 8% in the level of service per student. Consequently, we find a substantial mean increase of 62% in total elementary service delivered.

2.1 Changes in Title I Expenditures for Elementary Instruction

The increase in elementary service observed in the Demonstration LEAs was supported, in part, by an increase in Title I expenditures for elementary instruction. As shown in Table 2.2, there was a mean increase of 31% in

---

*A student full-time equivalent (FTE) is used here to measure instructional service per student. Student FTE is defined as the total amount of time a student spends in Title I instruction [(minutes per day)x(days per week)x(weeks per year)] in proportion to the total amount of time spent in all types of instruction. The total amount of Title I service is calculated by multiplying service per student by the total number of students served.

Data used for calculating student FTEs were collected from Title I program administrators. Student FTEs are, therefore, based on LEA reports of Title I service delivery.

TABLE 2.2

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN TITLE I EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION*

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	1975-76 ELEMENTARY EXPENDITURES	1976-77 ELEMENTARY EXPENDITURES	PERCENT CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	$ 78,520	$ 151,312	93%
Harrison County	354,370	506,510	41
Mesa	180,431	177,455	-2
Newport	129,288	274,530	112
Racine	417,679	791,838	90
Santa Fe	395,437	433,082	10
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	2,279,136	2,304,284	1
Winston-Salem	766,711	1,187,617	55
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	249,760	254,704	2
Boston	6,199,829	6,854,229	11
Houston	4,611,342	5,442,433	18
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock**	912,187	898,054	-2
Yonkers	1,606,615	1,175,645***	-27
MEAN	--	--	31%

*Excludes summer school.

**Figures reported for grades 1 through 8.

***Includes expenditures for 75 students, grades 6-8.

Title I expenditures for elementary instruction. The size of the change in such expenditures varied considerably among the LEAs, however. In three--Adams County #12, Newport, and Racine--Title I expenditures for elementary instruction either doubled or nearly doubled. In two--Harrison County and Winston-Salem--elementary Title I expenditures increased by about 50%. In three--Santa Fe, Boston, and Houston--expenditures increased substantially less (10%-18%), and in four--Mesa, Charlotte, Berkeley County, and Alum Rock--they showed virtually no change. Only one district, Yonkers, showed a substantial decrease in expenditures.

An increase in Title I expenditures for elementary instruction could have come from one or more of the following sources:

- An increase in Title I allocation to the LEA--Despite the fact that Demonstration LEAs received no additional Title I funds specifically for the purpose of implementing alternative allocation strategies, their Title I grants may have increased for other reasons. A Title I allocation may change either as a result of a change in the poverty count within an LEA or across other LEAs in the same state. It may also vary due to change in Title I appropriations at the Federal level.
- Availability and use of Title I "carry-over funds"*--If an LEA had carry-over funds from the preceding year, it may have used these funds in addition to its allocation to purchase resources with which to increase Title I service. However, using carry-over funds (as well as all regular allocation funds) to increase service is a "one time only" means of expansion, since those funds will not be available to carry over into the succeeding year.

---

*The term "carry-over funds" refers to any unspent portion of funds from the previous year's Title I allocation. The LEA is required to use carry-over funds within two years. Many districts, however, continue to carry over funds into the succeeding year, in part to cushion expenditures made before Title I funds are received by the LEA, and in part as a hedge against the possibility of decreased funding.

- Redistribution of resources within the total Title I program--By reallocating Title I funds, such as from the secondary to the elementary level or from auxiliary to instructional service, an LEA may have been able to increase the number of elementary students receiving Title I instruction without decreasing instructional service per student. Although this approach does not necessitate an increase in total resources available, resources for elementary instruction are increased.

In the remainder of this section, we will attempt to determine the extent to which the increases in elementary expenditures can be accounted for by each of these factors.

2.1.1 Changes in Title I Allocation and Use of Carry-Over Funds

Unlike the resource redistribution factor, both the allocation and the carry-over factors involve a change in total Title I expenditures. That is, an increase in allocation and/or carry-over depletion would affect the overall amount of Title I funds expended in a single year. Thus, as the first step in assessing the contribution of allocation and carry-over to increases in elementary expenditures, we must examine changes in total Title I expenditures.

As Table 2.3 shows, total Title I expenditures increased by an average of 7% in 1976-77. There was, however, a large range across the individual districts in change in total expenditures. Eight of the districts had increases which ranged from slight (Berkeley County, Racine, Adams County #12) to substantial (Harrison County, Newport). In contrast, five LEAs showed decreases in total expenditures. Most of these decreases were, however, small. The exception was Yonkers, which had a substantial decrease in total Title I expenditures.

TABLE 2.3

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN TOTAL TITLE I EXPENDITURES*

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION / LEA	1975-76 TOTAL TITLE I EXPENDITURES	1976-77 TOTAL TITLE I EXPENDITURES	PERCENT CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	$ 151,203	$ 160,970	6%
Harrison County	382,309	544,634	42
Mesa	407,293	377,563	-7
Newport	263,854	403,721	53
Racine	1,056,508	1,084,710	3
Santa Fe	634,734	562,444	-11
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	2,424,613	2,323,560	-4
Winston-Salem	1,533,542	1,852,539	21
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	264,432	270,962	2
Boston	8,856,899	9,694,470	9
Houston	7,413,733	8,154,660	10
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock	912,187	898,054	-2
Yonkers	1,744,663	1,220,178	-30
MEAN	--	--	7%

*Excludes summer school.

The average increase in total Title I expenditures was due to increases in both Title I allocations and use of carry-over funds. As Table 2.4 shows, Title I allocations increased by an average of 5% in 1976-77. Further, all but three LEAs had some increase in allocation. Most of these increases were small, ranging from 1% to 7%. However, two districts--Mesa and Santa Fe--had increases of 21% and 13%, respectively.

Table 2.5 indicates that carry-over funds were often depleted at a greater rate in 1976-77 than in 1975-76. On average, districts accumulated 11% less carry-over in 1976-77 than in 1975-76, and 16% less in 1977-78 than in 1976-77.

Three districts--Adams County #12, Newport, and Harrison County--accumulated carry-over funds during the baseline year and depleted these funds during the first implementation year. These three districts ranked #1, #3 and #5, respectively, in terms of percentage increase in service in the first implementation year. In contrast four districts--Santa Fe, Charlotte, Mesa, and Yonkers--depleted carry-over funds during the baseline year and accumulated these funds during the first implementation year. These districts ranked #7, #8 and #10, respectively, (Yonkers' rank was not available) in terms of percentage increase in service in the first implementation year. Thus, there appears to be a correlation between districts' overspending and underspending their Title I allocations in the baseline year, and the relative increase in service under waivers.

Finally, four districts--Racine, Winston-Salem, Boston, and Alum Rock--depleted carry-over funds during both the baseline and the first implementation year. The first three of these four districts depleted funds at a greater rate during the implementation year than in the baseline year.

TABLE 2.4

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN TITLE I ALLOCATIONS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	1975-76 ALLOCATION	1976-77 ALLOCATION	PERCENT CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	$ 160,132	$ 147,683	-8%
Harrison County	483,450	518,943	7
Mesa	336,143	407,420	21
Newport	305,775	314,038	3
Racine	879,788	876,502	0
Santa Fe	534,714	602,208	13
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	2,296,957	2,452,785	7
Winston-Salem	1,413,594	1,504,316	6
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	264,432	278,818	5
Boston	7,379,015	7,450,094	1
Houston	7,902,563	8,331,239	5
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock	817,319	864,496	6
Yonkers	1,434,966	1,343,370	-6
MEAN	--	--	5%

TABLE 2.5

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN CARRY-OVER USAGE[a]

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	CARRY-OVER FROM 1974-75 INTO 1975-76	CARRY-OVER FROM 1975-76 INTO 1976-77	CARRY-OVER FROM 1976-77 INTO 1977-78	PERCENT CHANGE IN CARRY-OVER ACCUMULATION FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77[b]	PERCENT CHANGE IN CARRY-OVER ACCUMULATION FROM 1976-77 TO 1977-78[b]
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools					
Adams County #12	$ 22,358	$ 31,287	$ 18,000	40%	-42%
Harrison County	74,687	175,828	150,137	135	-15
Mesa	116,529	45,379	75,235	-61	66
Newport	132,244	174,165	84,482	32	-51
Racine	496,928	320,208	112,000	-36	-65
Santa Fe	234,630	134,610	174,374	-43	30
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries					
Charlotte	779,965	652,309	781,534	-16	20
Winston-Salem	938,740	818,792	470,569	-13	-43
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty					
Berkeley County	0	0	7,856	0	NMF[c]
Boston	3,785,654	2,307,770	64,104	-39	-97
Houston	0	488,830	655,409	NMF[c]	(36)[d]
Districts making primarily intra-school changes					
Alum Rock	176,826	81,958	48,400	-54	-41
Yonkers	505,431	195,734	318,926	-61	63
MEAN	—	—	—	-11%	-16%[d]

[a] Summer school programs are excluded from the calculation of carry-over funds.

[b] Percent change in carry-over accumulation is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{(Carry-over into most recent year)} - \text{(Carry-over into preceding year)}}{\text{Carry-over into preceding year}}$$

[c] NMF indicates that no meaningful figure could be calculated.

[d] Because no meaningful figure is available for the 1975-76 to 1976-77 carry-over accumulation in Houston, the 1976-77 to 1977-78 figure is excluded from the latter cross-site mean.

In sum, we find that on the average the rate of carry-over depletion increased under the Demonstration. While the 5% increase in carry-over depletion from 1975-76 to 1976-77 is not a large absolute change, it does represent a proportional increase of 46% in the average rate of carry-over depletion. Furthermore, six districts depleted more than 40% of their carry-over funds in 1976-77. These districts may have difficulty maintaining the current level of expenditures (and services) beyond 1977-78, barring an increase in Title I allocations.

2.1.2 Redistribution of Resources Within Title I Programs

The average increase in total Title I expenditures of 7% (composed of changes in allocations and carry-over funds) did not match the average increase in elementary instructional expenditures of 31%. Thus, even if all of the increase in total Title I expenditures had been applied to the elementary expansion, it would not have fully accounted for the increase in elementary expenditures.

The balance of the increase in elementary instructional expenditures may be accounted for by the redistribution of dollars previously spent for non-elementary or non-instructional expenditures. As Table 2.6 shows, eight of the 11 Demonstration districts which provided non-elementary or non-instructional activities in 1975-76 reduced expenditures for these activities in 1976-77. These additional dollars, which in most cases were quite substantial, were potentially available for the expansion of the elementary instruction effort (ceteris paribus).

TABLE 2.6

COMPARISON OF TITLE I NON-ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION EXPENDITURES
IN 1975-76 AND 1976-77

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	(a) 1975-76			(b) 1976-77			(c)
POLICY OPTION / LEA	SECONDARY	PRE-KINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN	AUXILIARY SERVICES AND OTHER*	SECONDARY	PRE-KINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN	AUXILIARY SERVICES AND OTHER*	TOTAL DIFFERENCE IN NON-ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTIONAL EXPENDITURES (a-b)
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	$ 64,614	$ 0	$ 8,069	$ 0	$ 0	$ 9,658	$ -63,025
Harrison County	0	0	22,939	7,518	0	30,606	15,185
Mesa	161,461	63,279	2,122	150,090	48,284	1,734	-26,754
Newport	108,721	14,756	11,089	104,921	10,245	14,025	- 5,375
Racine	82,814	501,741	54,274	0	268,950	23,922	-345,957
Santa Fe	62,924	0	176,373	64,584	0	64,778	-109,935
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	0	0	145,477	0	0	19,276	-126,201
Winston-Salem	388,591	378,240	0	479,430	0	185,492	-101,909
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boston	1,461,852	565,308	669,812	1,819,390	566,638	454,219	143,275
Houston	291,929	1,387,148	1,123,314	0	1,544,633	1,167,594	-90,164
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yonkers	215,851	0	0	NA**	NA	NA	NA

*Other resource components include inservice training, PAC, and equipment purchases not readily allocated to specific instructional components.

**NA = Data not available.

2.1.3 Comparison of the Changes in Allocation, Carry-Over, and Redistribution of Resources

As discussed above, the increase in elementary instructional expenditures was supported by all three factors--increase in allocation, increase in carry-over usage, and redistribution of resources within Title I programs. However, the impact of these factors varied both within and across sites. As Table 2.7 shows, changes in elementary expenditures can be attributed to one or more of these three factors in the eight LEAs which had non-trivial (i.e., >2%) increases in such expenditures.*

It is apparent that no single factor consistently accounted for the increase in expenditures. In four of the eight districts, an increase in alloction was a notable contributing factor.** In six, change in use of carry-over was a notable contributing factor, accounting for all or nearly all of the increase in three districts. And, in four, redistribution of resources was a notable contributing factor, accounting for almost all of the increase in two districts.

The fact that no single factor consistently played the major role is even more apparent when we focus on the five LEAs which had the largest increases in Title I expenditures for elementary instruction (40% or more). For two of these LEAs--Adams County #12 and Racine--redistribution of resources accounted for most of the increase. For two others--Harrison County and Newport--change in carry-over usage accounted for the major portion of the increase.

---

*The dollar figures upon which Table 2.7 is based are shown in Appendix B, Table B-1.

**For purposes of discussion in this section, a change $\geq$20% in any factor is considered notable.

TABLE 2.7

PERCENT INCREASE IN TITLE I EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO CHANGE IN ALLOCATION, CARRY-OVER USAGE, AND REDISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES[a]

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	(a) PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN TI EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION 1975-76 TO 1976-77	PERCENTAGE OF (a) ATTRIBUTABLE TO INCREASE IN TOTAL TI EXPENDITURES		(d) PERCENTAGE OF (a) ATTRIBUTABLE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES WITHIN TI[d]
POLICY OPTION LEA		(b) ALLOCATION CHANGE[b]	(c) CHANGE IN CARRY-OVER USAGE[c]	
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools				
Adams County #12	93%	-17%	30%	87%
Harrison County	41	24	86	-10
Mesa	-2	NA[e]	NA	NA
Newport	112	6	91	3
Racine	90	-1	8	93
Santa Fe	10	179	-371	292
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries				
Charlotte	1	NA	NA	NA
Winston-Salem	55	22	54	24
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty				
Berkeley County	2	NA	NA	NA
Boston	11	11	117	-28
Houston	18	52	38	10
Districts making primarily intra-school changes				
Alum Rock	-2	NA	NA	NA
Yonkers	-27	NA	NA	NA

[a]Negative values in columns b through d indicate that either Title I allocations declined, carry-over was accumulated, or funds expended on non-elementary or non-instructional elementary activities in 1976-77 exceeded funds expended for these activities in 1975-76, respectively. Columns b+c+d = 100%.

[b]Percent of change in (a) attributable to allocation change = 1976-77 allocation - 1975-76 allocation (see Table 2.3 for dollar amount) divided by 1976-77 elementary expenditures - 1975-76 elementary expenditures.

[c]Percent of change in (a) attributable to carry-over depletion = (1976-77 total Title I expenditures - 1975-76 total Title I expenditures) divided by column b.

[d]Difference attributable to redistribution = column a - (columns b+c).

[e]NA indicates not applicable because Title I expenditures for elementary instruction either showed virtually no change (±2%) or declined.

And, in Winston-Salem, all three factors were important, although carry-over depletion accounted for the largest portion of the increase.

2.2 Changes in the Composition of Elementary Title I Program Costs

The preceding section has described factors which enabled the 13 Demonstration districts to increase elementary Title I expenditures by 31% in 1976-77 while at the same time increasing total Title I expenditures by 7%. However, the 31% increase in elementary expenditures does not fully account for the 62% increase in elementary services described above. Thus, we explore the possibility that districts shifted Title I funds and resources within the elementary program, or, in other words, changed the composition of Title I program costs. These changes can take two forms:

- Title I funds could be used to purchase more elementary resources that are used directly for provision of instruction (such as instructional staff) and fewer that provide only indirect support (such as administrative staff);
- Title I programs could increase the "real" elementary program costs (i.e., the value of all resources used) without a proportionate increase in Title I expenditures by increasing the use of resources which do not have to be paid for with current Title I funds (such as district-paid staff).

This section describes the extent to which each of these factors played a role in the expansion of elementary Title I services in the Demonstration LEAs.

2.2.1 Changes in Types of Elementary Resources Purchased with Title I Funds

Like most educational efforts, the Demonstration Title I programs spent most of their funds on personnel.

Table 2.8 shows that, on the average, Title I elementary expenditures for personnel were 87% of all expenditures in 1975-76 and 89% in 1976-77, changing little with the implementation of the Demonstration. Only three LEAs--Adams County #12, Newport, and Racine--showed notable shifts of resources from non-personnel to personnel. Only one--Winston-Salem (which chose to invest in audio-visual equipment in order to increase services)--showed a notable shift in the opposite direction.

The Demonstration districts also made no notable shift overall in the distribution of expenditures among administration, instruction, and other types of resources. (See Table 2.9.) On the average, expenditures made for instruction increased by 1%, while expenditures for administration decreased by 1% and other expenditures remained constant.

There was some variation among districts, however. Of the 12 LEAs for which data were available, seven shifted varying portions of expenditures toward instructional resources. Generally, in these seven districts expenditures tended to be shifted more often from administration than from other resources. Interestingly, five of these seven districts also increased personnel expenditures, indicating that in these districts Title I funds were used to increase instructional staff during 1976-77.

In summary, the Demonstration LEAs continued to spend the largest proportion of their Title I funds on instructional personnel during the first implementation year. Although the distribution of expenditures by resource type at the elementary level did not change substantially on the average between 1975-76 and 1976-77, there were small shifts in some districts toward increasing the proportion of funds used for personnel and instruction. This suggests that, to a limited extent, certain Demonstration

Table 2.8

DISTRIBUTION OF TITLE I EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION

(Personnel, Non-Personnel)

1975-76 and 1976-77

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION		PERSONNEL			NON-PERSONNEL		
POLICY OPTION	LEA	1975-75	1976-77	Difference	1975-76	1976-77	Difference
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
	Adams County #12	76%	90%	14%	24%	10%	-14%
	Harrison County	94	93	-1	6	7	1
	Mesa	95	94	-1	5	6	1
	Newport	88	95	7	12	5	-7
	Racine	90	98	8	10	2	-8
	Santa Fe	86	82	-4	14	18	4
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
	Charlotte	92	96	4	8	4	-4
	Winston-Salem	84	73	-11	16	27	11
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
	Berkeley County	96	98	2	4	2	-2
	Boston	88	93	5	12	7	-5
	Houston	78	75	-3	22	25	3
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
	Alum Rock	79	76	-3	21	24	3
	Yonkers	96	NA*	NA	4	NA	NA
MEAN**		87%	89%	2%	13%	11%	-2%

*NA = Data not available.

**Since 1976-77 data are not available, Yonkers is excluded from the calculation of the mean.

Table 2.9

DISTRIBUTION OF TITLE I EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION

(Administration, Instruction, Other)

1975-76 and 1976-77

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	ADMINISTRATION			INSTRUCTION			OTHER*		
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-75	1976-77	Difference	1975-76	1976-77	Difference	1975-76	1976-77	Difference
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools									
Adams County #12	12%	11%	-1%	80%	88%	8%	8%	1%	-7%
Harrison County	9	8	-1	90	90	0	1	1	0
Mesa	13	17	4	86	79	-7	1	4	3
Newport	11	8	-3	85	90	5	4	3	-1
Racine	18	15	-3	81	85	4	1	0	-1
Santa Fe	6	5	-1	85	87	2	9	8	-1
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries									
Charlotte	3	4	1	96	95	-1	1	1	0
Winston-Salem	6	3	-3	92	96	4	2	2	0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty									
Berkeley County	9	2	-7	88	96	8	3	2	-1
Boston	12	8	-4	88	92	4	0	0	0
Houston	12	14	2	86	80	-6	2	5	3
Districts making primarily intra-school changes									
Alum Rock	12	18	6	84	79	-5	4	3	-1
Yonkers	2	NA**	NA	97	NA	NA	1	NA	NA
MEAN***	10%	9%	-1%	87%	88%	1%	3%	3%	0%

*Includes resources such as operations and maintenance, transportation, etc.

**NA = Data not available.

***Since 1976-77 data are not available, Yonkers is excluded from the mean calculation.

districts increased instructional services by allocating more of their Title I funds for instructional personnel.

2.2.2 Changes in "Real" Program Costs and in the Use of Non-Title I Resources

In order to estimate the extent to which Title I expenditures reflected the "real" costs of providing Title I services, "estimated total costs" for elementary Title I instruction were compared to actual Title I expenditures for elementary instruction.

Estimated total costs are defined as the dollar value of all resources used by a Title I program to provide services to targeted students for one program year. Use of the following types of resources may change estimated total costs relative to actual expenditures:

- Resources provided to the Title I program by the district or by other compensatory programs which do not involve the expenditure of Title I funds (e.g., district instructional staff who provide services directly to Title I students, district administrative staff who provide services indirectly to Title I staff, and space provided by the district for Title I instruction). Use of such resources raises estimated total costs relative to Title I expenditures for a given year.
- Resources purchased with Title I funds in previous years, such as equipment or facilities, which are not reflected in current expenditures but whose estimated depreciated value is included in estimated total costs. Use of such resources raises estimated total costs relative to Title I expenditures for a given year.
- Current expenditures made for resources whose useful life is greater than one year, such as instructional equipment, which are adjusted to reflect an annualized value. (These are referred to as deferred current expenditures.) Purchase of such resources with Title I funds lowers estimated total costs relative to expenditures for a given year.

In calculating estimated total costs, all of these resources are taken into account.*

Table 2.10 shows elementary Title I expenditures and estimated total costs for the baseline and implementation years. For both 1975-76 and 1976-77, expenditures accounted on the average for 88% of estimated total costs, indicating that for both years, Title I expenditures represented a large percentage of "real" program costs. The lack of change in the ratio of expenditures to estimated total costs indicates that on the average, estimated total costs for elementary Title I instruction increased proportionally as elementary Title I expenditures increased.

The closeness with which expenditures approximated total costs is even more apparent when we examine individual LEAs. In eight of the 11 districts for which data were available in both years, expenditures either slightly exceeded or came within 90-95% of estimated total costs.** During 1975-76, only three LEAs--Adams County #12, Mesa, and Berkeley County--had substantially higher estimated total costs than expenditures. Two of these districts--Mesa and Berkeley County--continued to show substantially higher estimated total costs in 1976-77. In addition, in 1976-77, Newport, in contrast to the preceding year, also showed substantially higher estimated total costs than expenditures.

---

*For a more complete description of the methodology used to calculate estimated total costs, see James Vanecko, Francis Archambault, Nancy Ames, et al., ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Implementation Decisions and Research Plan (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., December 9, 1977) Chapter 9, and Jane Huseby (Sjogren) and Guilbert Hentschke, "Studying the Costs of Title I under Achievement and Poverty Allocation Criteria," (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., April, 1977). Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, April, 1977.

**Expenditures will exceed total costs in cases where costs for deferred current expenditures are greater than costs for donated resources plus depreciated value for prior expenditures.

TABLE 2.10

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN ELEMENTARY TITLE I EXPENDITURES AND ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION		1975-76			1976-77			
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
POLICY OPTION	LEA	EXPENDITURES	ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS	RATIO OF EXPENDITURES TO ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS (a/b)	EXPENDITURES	ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS	RATIO OF EXPENDITURES TO ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS	CHANGE IN RATIO OF EXPENDITURES TO ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS (f-c)
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
	Adams County #12	$ 78,520	$ 151,000	52%	$ 151,312	$ 154,106	98%	46%
	Harrison County	359,370	355,812	101	506,516	511,626	99	-2
	Mesa	180,431	400,958	45	177,455	403,307	44	-1
	Newport	129,288	112,424	115	274,530	361,224	76	-39
	Racine	417,679	439,662	95	791,838	791,838	100	5
	Santa Fe	395,437	439,374	90	433,082	465,680	93	3
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
	Charlotte	2,279,136	2,279,136	100	2,304,284	2,504,656	92	-8
	Winston-Salem	766,711	773,050	99	1,187,617	1,099,645	108	9
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
	Berkeley County	249,760	356,800	70	254,704	385,816	66	-4
	Boston	6,199,829	6,326,356	98	6,854,229	7,370,139	93	-5
	Houston	4,611,342	4,753,961	97	5,442,433	5,668,201	96	-1
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
	Alum Rock**	912,187	NA*	NA	898,054	NA	NA	NA
	Yonkers**	1,606,615	1,709,165	94	1,173,645	NA	NA	NA
MEAN***				88%			88%	0.2%

*NA = Data not available.

**Estimated total costs were not calculated for Alum Rock, as the nature of their Title I program did not allow program administrators to differentiate regular from Title I services. Estimated total costs for Yonkers were not calculated because adequate data was not available from the district.

***Since 1976-77 data are not available for Yonkers, this LEA is excluded from the 1975-76 mean.

As Table 2.11 shows, all districts made some use of donated resources, but such resources generally accounted for negligible or very small portions of estimated total costs. Only in Adams County #12, Mesa, and Berkeley County in 1975-76 and Mesa, Newport, and Berkeley County in 1976-77 was the ratio of donated resources to estimated total costs substantial. It is nonetheless interesting to note that six of the 11 LEAs for which data are available increased their use of donated resources under the Demonstration (albeit slightly in most cases), while only two LEAs decreased their use of donated resources.

As noted previously, donated resources can come from a variety of sources. In two of the four districts which made substantial use of such resources--Adams County #12 and Mesa--non-Title I resources were provided by the LEA. In Berkeley County, such resources were provided by the federal Emergency School Aid Assistance (ESAA). In Newport, they were provided by the state/local compensatory program and the federal School Assistance to Federally Affected Areas (SAFA) program.

Adams County #12 made the most substantial change in use of donated resources from the planning to the first implementation year. The reduction in use of such resources was primarily due to the district's decision to formalize local compensatory efforts which had supplemented Title I during the planning year into a program serving grades which were no longer served by Title I. In contrast, Newport in 1975-76 provided Title I and state/local resources to students at different elementary grade levels. With the pooling of resources and services for all elementary grades in 1976-77, the use of donated resources increased.*

---

*See Section 3.5 for additional discussion regarding coordination among the various compensatory education programs.

TABLE 2.11

CONTRIBUTION OF DONATED RESOURCES

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	1975-76 (a) ESTIMATED VALUE OF DONATED RESOURCES	1975-76 (b) ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS	1975-76 (c) RATIO OF DONATED RESOURCES TO ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS (a/b)	1976-77 (d) ESTIMATED VALUE OF DONATED RESOURCES	1976-77 (e) ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS	1976-77 (f) RATIO OF DONATED RESOURCES TO ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS (d/e)	(g) CHANGE IN RATIO (f-c)
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	$ 73,245	$ 151,000	49%	$ 1,490	$ 154,106	1%	-48%
Harrison County	2,969	355,812	1	5,814	511,626	1	0
Mesa	220,527	400,958	55	221,497	403,307	55	0
Newport	11,668	112,424	10	82,781	361,224	23	13
Racine	4,605	439,662	1	6,085	791,838	1	0
Santa Fe	31,529	439,374	7	13,550	465,680	3	-4
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	11,104	2,279,136	1	188,268	2,504,656	8	7
Winston-Salem	106,135	773,050	14	165,443	1,099,645	15	1
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	92,273	356,800	26	115,992	385,816	30	4
Boston	326,083	6,326,356	5	417,251	7,370,139	6	1
Houston	130,134	4,753,961	3	356,620	5,668,201	6	3
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Yonkers	NA	1,709,165	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MEAN	--	--	16%	--	--	14%	-2%

*NA = Data not available.

In sum, we see that "real" program costs increased as services increased under the Demonstration. Since Title I expenditures also increased, however, there was little change in the ratio of expenditures to estimated total costs overall. For most districts, Title I expenditures accounted for all or almost all of estimated total costs in both 1975-76 and 1976-77. Only four districts made substantial use of donated resources in either year of the Demonstration Study. In two of these, there was a shift over time, with Adams County #12 decreasing the use of such resources and Newport increasing their use. While not comprising a major portion of estimated total costs, the availability of such resources may have contributed directly to service expansion in some districts and enabled others to shift Title I resources towards elementary instruction.

2.3 Costs Per Student and Per Student FTE

Costs per student are a function of both the number of students served and program costs. As we have discussed in Section 2.0, the number of elementary students served by Title I increased by an average of 74%. (See Table 2.1.) As we have discussed in preceding sections of this chapter, program costs as measured by both Title I expenditures and estimated total costs also increased, but not to the same extent as the increase in students. (See Table 2.10.) Thus, as we see in Table 2.12, costs per student (as measured by both Title I expenditures and estimated total costs) actually decreased under the Demonstration.

In addition to changes in costs per student under the Demonstration, it is interesting to look at changes in costs of service. To explore this issue we need to use a measure of service that is standard or comparable across time. Such a measure is the student Full Time Equivalent (FTE), which might be defined as the standard

TABLE 2.12

TITLE I EXPENDITURES AND ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS PER ELEMENTARY STUDENT*

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	ELEMENTARY TITLE I EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT			ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS PER ELEMENTARY TITLE I STUDENT		
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76	1976-77	% CHANGE	1975-76	1976-77	% CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools						
Adams County #12	$364	$193	-47%	$699	$197	-72%
Harrison County	251	269	7	249	272	9
Mesa	72	54	-25	161	123	-24
Newport	631	606	-4	548	797	45
Racine	696	626	-10	733	626	-15
Santa Fe	466	326	-30	518	350	-32
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries						
Charlotte	346	317	-8	346	345	0
Winston-Salem	418	371	-11	422	343	-19
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty						
Berkeley County	269	182	-32	384	276	-28
Boston	610	610	0	622	656	5
Houston	181	235	30	186	244	31
Districts making primarily intra-school changes						
Alum Rock	173	73	-58	NA**	NA	NA
Yonkers	676	270	-60	NA	NA	NA
MEAN % CHANGE***	--	--	-19%	--	--	-9%

*Expenditures and estimated total costs per student are calculated by simply dividing each cost measure by the number of students served. Dollar amounts for expenditures and estimated total costs by district are shown in Table 10. The number of students served by district is shown in Table 2.1.

**NA = Data not available.

***The mean percent change in expenditures per student is -11.8% when Alum Rock and Yonkers are excluded.

unit of service delivered.* (It is important to note that while the student FTE provides a standardized measure of amount of service, it does not convey information about the characteristics of that service.)

As Table 2.13 shows, neither expenditures nor estimated total costs per FTE student changed a great deal under the Demonstration, on the average. However, the variation across districts is such that it may be misleading to draw any conclusion based on the average change. For example, of the 13 Demonstrtion districts, nine showed decreases in Title I expenditures per FTE student. Of the 11 districts for which data are available, seven showed similar decreases in estimated total costs per FTE student. Clearly, for these districts, the cost of a unit of service decreased with the Demonstration. Conversely, for four LEAs--Newport, Racine, Boston, and Houston--expenditures and estimated total costs per FTE student increased, generally, by a fairly substantial percentage. Thus, for these four districts, the cost of a unit of service increased with the Demonstration.

2.4 Summary

During the first implementation year, there was a large change in the number of elementary students receiving instructional service in the Demonstration districts, but not a very large change in the amount of service received per elementary student. Thus, overall, the amount of service received increased substantially.

This increase was supported by a number of fiscal factors. These were changes in the total availability of Title I funds (allocations to LEAs and use of carry-over funds), shifting of resources to elementary instruction

---

*See Section 2.0 for a discussion of how student FTE is calculated.

TABLE 2.13

TITLE I EXPENDITURES AND ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS
PER ELEMENTARY STUDENT FTE*

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION		EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT FTE			ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS PER STUDENT FTE		
POLICY OPTION	LEA	1975-76	1976-77	% CHANGE	1975-76	1976-77	% CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
	Adams County #12	$7,698	$3,1[illegible]	-59%	$14,804	$ 3,224	-78%
	Harrison County	4,655	4,[illegible]	-7	4,609	4,380	-5
	Mesa	1,903	1,[illegible]	-11	4,230	3,834	-9
	Newport	6,914	7,8[illegible]	14	6,012	10,350	72
	Racine	5,274	8,579	63	5,551	8,579	55
	Santa Fe	5,012	4,465	-11	5,569	4,801	-14
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
	Charlotte	3,121	2,621	-16	3,121	2,849	-9
	Winston-Salem	3,030	2,504	-17	3,056	2,318	-24
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
	Berkeley County	5,269	3,724	-29	7,527	5,642	-25
	Boston	3,697	4,618	25	3,772	4,966	32
	Houston	1,808	2,370	31	1,864	2,468	32
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
	Alum Rock	386	250	-35	NA**	NA	NA
	Yonkers	6,323	2,612	-59	NA	NA	NA
MEAN % CHANGE***		—	—	-9%	—	—	2.5%

*Expenditures and estimated total costs per student FTE are calculated by simply dividing each cost measure by the number of students served. Dollar amounts for expenditures and estimated total costs by district are shown in Table 2.10. The number of FTE students served by district is shown in Table 2.1.

**NA = Data not available.

***The mean percent change in expenditures per student is -2% when Alum Rock and Yonkers are excluded.

within the Title I program, different use of Title I dollars within elementary instruction, and changes in the availability of donated resources. The extent to which each of these factors played a role in program expansion varied considerably across districts. In general, however, carry-over depletion and redistribution of resources appeared to be the most salient factors. The extent to which certain of the Demonstration districts could sustain their increased level of service beyond the Demonstration, given their heavy reliance on carry-over funds, is questionable.

The net effect of the changes in service and changes in expenditures (and estimated total costs) was that the cost of a unit of service changed under the Demonstration. In most of the 13 districts, this cost decreased. In four, it increased. These changes in the costs of providing service indicate that some changes in service delivery took place. In those districts where we see decreases, we might surmise that there were changes in the delivery of service that led to savings in the costs of service and aided in elementary expansion. Where we see increases, we might surmise that these types of changes did not occur and were not a factor in the expansion. The following chapter describes the changes in the characteristics of service, i.e., service delivery, that occurred under the Demonstration.

3.0 PROGRAM DELIVERY

This chapter has two primary purposes. First, the chapter is designed to extend Chapter 2, which described the fiscal factors supporting program expansion. That is, we present very detailed information on service delivery in order to determine whether the major finding of an overall increase in instructional service at the elementary level, without a proportionate increase in dollars, is substantiated. Certain program delivery changes (such as increases in staff) may have required increases in expenditures, as were described in Chapter 2. Others (such as increases in the amount of direct instruction provided by existing staff) may not have been accompanied by dollar increases. These latter changes may help account for the fact that districts were able to deliver more services than one would expect given the observed increase in dollars. Both types of program delivery changes are discussed in this chapter.

Our program delivery data suggest that it was indeed possible for the Demonstration districts to serve more students, largely in existing modes, with less than a proportionate increase in dollars. True, there may have been subtle changes in the amount and nature of services that were not measured. These may imply that Title I services were used more efficiently. We are fairly confident, however, that if there were large decreases in services delivered per student, our measures would have been sensitive enough to find them.

The second purpose of Chapter 3 is a descriptive one. In the baseline year report, we provided much detailed information on how these districts organized the delivery of Title I services.* That information was designed to

---

*See James J. Vanecko, Francis X. Archambault, and Nancy L. Ames, ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Analysis of Baseline Data, Volumes I and II Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., October 31, 1977).

supplement the National Survey of Title I school districts, sponsored by the National Institute of Education.* This chapter presents similar information for the first implementation year, in an attempt to identify changes which may have been brought about under the implementation of waivers. It was expected that such changes would result directly from the adoption of a particular allocation policy, particularly one involving expansion to more schools or students. They may also have been effected by the occasion of the Demonstration and the scrutiny which such programs generally received during the course of the study. That is, the Demonstration provided the 13 districts with a general opportunity to evaluate their Title I programs and make service delivery changes.

The overall impression from our program delivery analyses is one of continuity, however, not dramatic change. Other than the change in program focus--i.e., the shifting of resources towards elementary instruction--the manner in which service was provided remained relatively stable over time.

Included in the chapter are a variety of program delivery patterns. We describe changes in the following areas:

- scope of services and activities;
- staffing and staff development;
- program operations;
- individualization of instruction; and
- coordination of programs.

In assessing program delivery, we have triangulated the responses of three different groups: program administrators, school principals, and teaching staff, including both classroom teachers and compensatory specialists. In addition,

---

*Compensatory Education Services (Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, July 31, 1977).

we have used both qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection and analysis. The principal and teaching staff responses were obtained by means of structured surveys administered at various points during the school year. The administrator descriptions were obtained by means of semi-structured, informal interviews conducted during site visits made by AAI staff members.* Table 3.1 displays the data sources and samples utilized for each type of program delivery data discussed.

In analyzing the program delivery data, we have focused on identifying the general cross-district patterns that emerge from the total set of information on hand. These cross-district patterns are based on a wealth of detailed site-level data which are presented in Appendices C and D. While the text of this chapter focuses on the cross-site patterns, individual sites are highlighted as representative of the general pattern (or as deviations) where appropriate.

3.1 Changes in the Scope of Services and Activities

As discussed in Section 2.1, redistribution of resources within the Title I program was an important factor in the Demonstration districts' ability to expand elementary services. Districts frequently reduced or eliminated expenditures for activities other than elementary instruction. These expenditure reductions translate into a variety of changes in both the services offered and the grade spans covered by total Title I programs, as shown in Table 3.2.**

---

*These interviews provided both quantitative and qualitative data on a variety of topics. Our program delivery analysis focuses largely on the quantitative data. The qualitative data provided by administrators is treated in Chapter 4.0 of this report.

**Data on compensatory services at the school level are presented in Tables C-1 through C-8, Appendix C.

Table 3.1

PROGRAM DELIVERY INSTRUMENTATION AND RESPONDENT GROUPS

DATA TYPE	INSTRUMENT/DATA SOURCE	SAMPLE
Services & Activities	Site Descriptions Principal Questionnaire	District Administrators All Elementary Principals
Staffing	Site Descriptions Principal Questionnaire Teacher Background Form	District Administrators All Elementary Principals All Sampled Teachers and Compensatory Language Arts and Math Specialists
Operations	Site Descriptions Principal Questionnaire Instructional Schedule	District Administrators All Elementary Principals All Compensatory Language Arts and Math Specialists
Individualization of Instruction	Site Descriptions Program Description Modules	District Administrators All Sampled Teachers and Compensatory Language Arts and Math Specialists
Coordination of Programs	Site Descriptions	District Administrators

TABLE 3.2
CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN GRADE LEVEL COVERAGE OF
MAJOR TITLE I INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE 13 DEMONSTRATION SITES

DATA SOURCE: SITE DESCRIPTIONS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION / POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-1976			1976-77			CHANGES
	EARLY CHILDHOOD	READING	MATH	EARLY CHILDHOOD	READING	MATH	
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	--	1-12	1-8	--	1-3	--	Shifted reading into grades 1-3 only, from 1-12. Dropped math component.
Harrison County	--	1-6	--	--	1-7	--	Extended reading component to 7th grade.
Mesa	Pre-K+K	1-12	1-12	Pre-K+K	1-12	1-12	No change.
Newport	Pre-K	4-12	--	Pre-K	1-9	--	Extended reading to early elementary grades. Dropped high school reading program 1/2-way thru 76-77 school year.
Racine	Pre-K+K	1-9	--	Pre-K	1-6	--	Dropped junior high reading. Dropped kindergarten program.
Santa Fe	--	1-8	--	--	1-8	7-8	Reading program unchanged. Instituted middle school math program.
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	--	2-6	4-6	--	2-6	4-6	No change.
Winston-Salem	K	1-8	7-10	--	1-8	3-4 7-10	Dropped kindergarten program. Added elementary math in one school.
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County*	--	1-6	1-6	--	2-5	2-5	Dropped 6th grade reading. Dropped 1st & 6th grade reading.
Boston	K	1-8	1-5	K	1-8	1-5	No change.
Houston	Pre-K+K	1-10	1-8	Pre-K+K	1-6	1-6	Dropped secondary reading and math.
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	--	1-8	1-8	--	1-8	1-8	No change.
Yonkers	--	1-12	2-5	--	1-8	1-6	Eliminated high school reading program. Extended math program to grades 1 and 6.

*Berkeley County also provided in-class general tutorial aides for grade one students in 1975-76 and 1976-77. Since, however, the major thrust of Berkeley County's program are the reading and math services provided by the labs, we have focused on the changes in grade level coverage for this lab component.

As displayed in this table, all districts offered reading in both 1975-76 and 1976-77 and eight offered math in both years. However, Adams County #12 dropped Title I math services in 1976-77 entirely and Santa Fe added them. With respect to early childhood education, two districts, Racine and Winston-Salem, dropped kindergarten services entirely. Racine, however, retained pre-kindergarten instructional services. Interestingly, while five districts continued to offer early childhood instructional services in 1976-77, no districts chose to add such services.

Five districts either eliminated or reduced Title I services in the secondary grades. Adams County #12, Racine, and Houston eliminated such services entirely, while Newport and Yonkers substantially reduced the number of secondary grades covered. Two districts, on the other hand, added secondary programs. Harrison County extended reading services into grade 7, and Santa Fe instituted math services in grades 7 and 8. Finally, a number of other districts modified the elementary grade span covered by the Title I services.

The decision of the Demonstration districts to reduce or eliminate secondary and early childhood services to facilitate elementary expansion is illuminated further when we look at the percent of total Title I funds expended on major program activities. As Table 3.3 shows, for each of the ten districts for which information was available, the percent of total Title I funds expended on elementary instruction increased in 1976-77. The four districts which exhibited large increases (greater than 15%) in the percent of funds allocated to elementary instruction generally shifted their focus from secondary and/or early childhood instruction.

Within the elementary grades, districts made few, if any, changes of note in the proportion of funds allocated to differing instructional areas. As shown by Table 3.4,

TABLE 3.3

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 to 1976-77 IN PERCENT OF TITLE I FUNDS EXPENDED BY MAJOR ACTIVITY

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION			SECONDARY INSTRUCTION			EARLY CHILDHOOD INSTRUCTION			OTHER[a]		
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools												
Adams County #12	51.6%	94.4%	42.8%	43.1%	--	-43.1%	--	--	--	5.3%	5.6%	.03%
Harrison County	93.6	94.2	0.6	--	1.4	1.4	--	--	--	6.4	4.4	-2.0
Mesa	43.0	45.1	2.1	39.7	39.8	0.1	15.5	12.8	-2.7	1.8	2.3	0.5
Newport	49.0	67.7	18.7	41.9	26.3	-15.6	5.6	2.5	-3.1	3.5	3.5	--
Racine	39.2	72.0	32.8	7.8	--	-7.8	46.4	24.5	-21.9	6.6	3.5	-3.1
Santa Fe	76.3	77.7	1.4	11.2	11.5	0.3	--	--	--	12.5	10.8	-1.7
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries												
Charlotte	94.5	99.4	4.9	--	--	--	--	--	--	5.5	0.6	-4.9
Winston-Salem	49.8	67.2	17.4	25.1	27.5	2.4	21.9	--	-21.9	3.2	5.3	2.1
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty												
Berkeley County	NA[b]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Boston	69.8	70.7	0.9	16.3	18.8	2.5	6.4	5.8	-0.6	7.5	4.7	-2.8
Houston	62.2	66.9	4.7	4.5	--	-4.5	18.7	18.9	0.2	14.6	14.2	-0.4
Districts making primarily intra-school changes												
Alum Rock	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Yonkers	86.1	NA	NA	11.6	NA	NA	--	NA	NA	2.3	NA	NA
MEAN	--	--	12.6%	--	--	-7.2%	--	--	-8.3%	--	--	-1.2%

[a]Includes auxiliary services, PAC, inservice training, and equipment and facilities unspecified as to instructional component.

[b]NA = Data Not Available.

TABLE 3.4

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 to 1976-77 IN PERCENT OF
TITLE I ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTIONAL FUNDS EXPENDED BY SUBJECT AREA

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	READING			MATH			OTHER[a]		
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools									
Adams County #12	84.2%	100.0%	15.8%	15.8%	NP[b]	-15.8%	NP	NP	NP
Harrison County	100.0	100.0	0	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Mesa	64.3	55.7	-8.6	35.7	44.3	8.6	NP	NP	NP
Newport	100.0	100.0	0	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Racine	97.3	98.2	0.9	NP	NP	NP	2.7	1.8	-0.9
Santa Fe	100.0	100.0	0	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries									
Charlotte	62.7	62.4	-0.3	35.1	35.9	0.8	2.2	1.7	-0.5
Winston-Salem	100.0	96.7	-3.3[c]	NP	3.3	3.3	NP	NP	NP
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty									
Berkeley County	NA[d]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Boston	80.0	78.1	-1.9[c]	11.2	14.5	3.3	8.8	7.4	-1.4
Houston	67.7	54.6	-13.1[c]	12.5	16.4	3.9	19.8	29.0	9.2
Districts making primarily intra-school changes									
Alum Rock	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Yonkers	83.5	NA	NA	13.9	NA	NA	2.6	NA	NA
MEAN	--	--	-1.1%	--	--	0.7%	--	--	1.6%

[a] Includes ESL, computer assisted instruction, music and dance instruction, etc.

[b] NP = No services offered.

[c] Since elementary expenditure increased substantially, a decrease in the percentage of funds allocated to a subject area does not necessarily mean a decrease in absolute expenditures for that area. In fact, absolute expenditures may have actually increased.

[d] NA = Data not available.

districts continued to spend the major portion of their funds for reading. Of the districts offering math services, most tended to increase slightly the portion of funds allocated to math. (The exception is of course Adams County #12, which eliminated math entirely.) However, in comparison with reading, the portion of funds allocted to math generally remained small.

3.2 Changes in Staffing Patterns

As discussed in Section 2.2.1, the largest expenditure of Title I funds at the elementary level in both 1975-76 and 1976-77 was for personnel. In fact, 87% of elementary Title I expenditures was allocated for personnel in 1975-76, 89% in 1976-77. This not surprising emphasis on personnel expenditures was also evident for the total Title I program. In 1975-76 personnel expenditures amounted to 83% of total Title I expenditures and in 1976-77, 88%, an increase of 5%. The small increases in personnel expenditures between 1975-76 and 1976-77 alone were not great enough to provide adequate staff for the expansion of Title I services. Thus, we need to examine the possibility that districts made other personnel changes. Specifically, districts may have changed:

- general staffing patterns, e.g., decreased administrative and increased instructional staff;
- instructional staffing patterns, e.g., switched from specialists to less expensive aides as the primary deliverers of instruction;
- the way the instructional staff were utilized, e.g., increased the amount of time staff spent in direct instruction as opposed to non-instructional activities such as record-keeping;
- instructional staff qualifications, e.g., switched to instructional staff with less experience.

Further, changes in staffing patterns and utilization may have been accompanied by changes in staff development. The following sections examine each of these possibilities.

3.2.1 Changes in General Staffing Patterns for the Total Title I Program

For the total Title I program, staff changes were generally small, although some shifts can be discerned. (See Table 3.5.) On the average, the number of FTE staff declined less than 1% across all districts. This is consistent with fiscal constraints discussed in Chapter 2.0 of this report.* For seven of the twelve LEAs, total FTE staff declined, and these declines ranged from 5% in Adams County #12 to 19% in Berkeley County.

A look at the number of instructional personnel in the total Title I program indicates that the number of specialists declined on average 1.9%, while the number of aides increased 2.3%. Thus, overall, LEAs maintained the same number of teachers/specialists and paraprofessional

---

*Total Title I expenditures increased 7% in 1976-77. Thus, as the chart below indicates, the net effect of a shift toward personnel expenditures, adjusted for inflation of personnel salaries, was a decrease of 2.4% in the purchasing power of the Title I personnel dollar.

	1975-76	1976-77
A. Total Title I Expenditures	$100.00	$107.00
B. Percent Spent on Personnel	83%	88%
C. Purchasing Power	100%	86% (Adjusted for observed 14% inflation in personnel salaries)
D. Net Effect (A x B x C)	$ 83.00	$ 80.98

TABLE 3.5

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN NUMBER OF FTE STAFF SERVING THE TOTAL TITLE I PROGRAM

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	INSTRUCTIONAL				ADMINISTRATIVE		AUXILIARY		TOTAL FTE STAFF	
	SPECIALISTS		AIDES							
POLICY OPTION LEA	Change in N	% Change	Change in N	% Change	Change in N	% Change	Change in N	% Change	Change in N	% Change
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools										
Adams County #12	1.5	23.0%	- 3.0	-43.0%	0.3	20.0%	0.5	0.0%	- 0.8	- 5.0%
Harrison County	4.3	23.0	- 2.7	-11.0	-0.1	- 4.0	0.8	80.0	2.3	5.0
Mesa	-6.3	-53.0	9.6	17.0	-1.2	-24.0	0.2	100.0	2.3	3.0
Newport	8.0	62.0	2.2	58.0	-2.2	-55.0	- 0.1	- 10.0	7.9	36.0
Racine	0.5	2.0	5.7	7.0	-5.8	-43.0	- 8.2	- 80.0	- 7.8	- 6.0
Santa Fe	-0.3	- 2.0	7.0	29.0	--	--	- 2.1	- 37.0	4.6	11.0
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries										
Charlotte	-5.0	- 4.0	-12.2	-10.0	2.0	67.0	- 6.0	- 75.0	-21.2	- 8.0
Winston-Salem	-5.9	-16.0	25.0	29.0	-3.0	-60.0	-24.0	- 86.0	- 7.9	- 5.0
Districts that rank schools pribarily by poverty										
Berkeley County	- 1.0	-17.0	- 6.7	-19.0	-0.7	-70.0	--	--	- 8.4	-19.0
Boston	12.2	3.0	27.5	7.0	-11.5	-21.0	2.0	3.0	30.2	4.0
Houston	-40.0	-12.0	-45.5	-19.0	30.6	99.0	4.2	11.0	-50.5	- 8.0
Districts making primarily intra-school changes										
Alum Rock	- 3.3	-32.0	- 9.7	-18.0	2.6	95.0	- 2.2	- 33.0	-12.5	17.0
Yonkers*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MEAN PERCENTAGE		-1.9%		2.3%		-3.0%		-10.6%		-0.8%

*Figures for Yonkers are not included since data from 1976-77 were not available.

aides for the delivery of compensatory instruction in 1976-77. The number of adminstrative personnel in the total Title I program decined an average of 3% in 1976-77 while the number of auxiliary staff declined 10.6%.

Table C-9 of Appendix C illustrates the net effect that changes in the numbers of instructional, administrative, and auxiliary staff had on the percentage distribution of such personnel across districts. These shifts may be summarized as follows:

- Instructional personnel, which represented 87.3% of total Title I personnel in 1975-76, increased to 90.3% in 1976-77.
- Administrative personnel, which represented 6.3% of total Title I personnel in 1975-76, declined to 5.5% in 1976-77.
- Auxiliary staff, which accounted for 6.4% of total Title I personnel in 1975-76, declined to 4.2% in 1976-77.

While the absolute percent changes were not large for all three categories, the proportional percent changes for administrative and auxiliary staff were substantial (-13% and -34%, respectively).

3.2.2 Changes in General Staffing Patterns at the Elementary Level

As Table 3.6 shows, the number of elementary personnel increased an average 15.3% in 1976-77. It should be noted that much of this increase was concentrated in two LEAs, Adams County #12 and Newport, which had increases of 110% and 94% respectively. In fact, on the average, total elementary personnel in the other 10 LEAs declined by 2.1%. While the number of instructional personnel increased an average of 13.9% at the elementary level in 1976-77, the number of specialists increased almost four times as much as

did the number of aides. The four LEAs which employed other instructional personnel in 1975-76, i.e., resource teachers, reported 100% declines in the number of other instructional personnel employed in 1976-77, thus reflecting the LEAs' shift of instructional personnel resources to direct instruction in order to serve more students.

While the number of administrative personnel increased an average of 39.2% in 1976-77 at the elementary level, this was due, at least in part, to the fact that total Title I administrative personnel was prorated at the elementary level by the relative size (i.e., number of students) of the elementary component. Although the LEAs chose to increase professional instructional personnel more than paraprofessional instructional staff, this was not the case with administrative personnel. As Table 3.6 indicates, the number of secretarial administrative staff was increased almost five times as much as the professional administrative staff. Thus, the LEAs appear to have treated professional administrative staff as quasi-fixed costs, and at the same time expanded secretarial administrative personnel to manage the increased paperwork created by the increase in students served.

The fact that the average amount of elementary services increased by 62% while the number of elementary instructional personnel increased by only 13.9% suggests that the student/instructional staff ratio increased during the first implementation year. Table 3.7 indicates that this was indeed the case, as the number of FTE students per instructional staff member increased 39.1% across all sites in 1976-77. Ten of the twelve LEAs show an increase in the number of FTE students/instructional staff. The fact that Boston shows a decline is consistent with the finding that Boston was one of only two LEAs to show a decline in elementary services in 1976-77 (see Chapter 2.0, Table 2.1). Two factors which may have contributed to the LEAs'

TABLE 3.6

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 to 1976-77 IN
ELEMENTARY STAFFING BY PERSONNEL TYPE

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION		PERSONNEL TYPE							
		INSTRUCTIONAL			TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	ADMINISTRATIVE		TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL	TOTAL ELEMENTARY PERSONNEL
POLICY OPTION	LEA	TEACHER/ SPECIALIST	AIDES	OTHER PERSONNEL[a]		PROFESSIONAL	SECRETARIAL		
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools									
	Adams County # 12								
	N 1975-76	3.5	2.5	--	6	.41	--	.41	6.41
	N 1976-77	8.0	4.0	--	12	.45	1.0	1.45	13.45
	Percent Change	129	60	--	100	10	NMF[b]	254	110
	Harrison County								
	N 1975-76	19	25	--	44	1.02	.74	1.76	45.76
	N 1976-77	22.5	23	--	45.5	1.27	.98	2.25	47.75
	Percent Change	18	-8	--	3	25	32	28	4
	Mesa								
	N 1975-76	0	40.6	1.0	41.6	.66	.87	1.53	43.13
	N 1976-77	0	39.1	--	39.1	.77	.98	1.75	40.85
	Percent Change	0	-4	-100	- 6	17	13	14	-5
	Newport								
	N 1975-76	3.7	3.4	2.7	9.8	.25	.34	.59	10.39
	N 1976-77	14	5	--	19	.51	.67	1.18	20.18
	Percent Change	278	47	-100	94	104	97	100	94
	Racine								
	N 1975-76	11	55	6.5	72.5	3.9	2.1	6.0	78.5
	N 1976-77	19	60	--	79	2.5	4.3	6.8	85.8
	Percent Change	73	9	-100	9	-36	105	13	9
	Santa Fe								
	N 1975-76	14.3	14	--	28.3	.8	.8	1.6	29.9
	N 1976-77	14	19	--	33	.8	1.6	2.4	35.4
	Percent Change	-2	36	--	17	--	100	50	18

[a]Includes Resource Teachers who provide support to the teachers, but do not provide actual instruction to the students.

[b]NMF = No meaningful figure.

TABLE 3.6 (Continued)

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	PERSONNEL TYPE							
	INSTRUCTIONAL			TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	ADMINISTRATIVE		TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL	TOTAL ELEMENTARY PERSONNEL
POLICY OPTION / LEA	TEACHER/ SPECIALIST	AIDES	OTHER PERSONNEL[a]		PROFESSIONAL	SECRETARIAL		
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte								
N 1975-76	123	115.5	4	242.5	1.7	.75	2.45	244.95
N 1976-77	118.6	104	0	222.6	2.7	2.2	4.8	227.4
Percent Change	-4	-10	-100	-8	29	247	95	-7
Winston-Salem								
N 1975-76	34	57	--	91	2.55	2.02	4.57	95.57
N 1976-77	23.3	75	.9	99.2	.5	.25	.75	99.95
Percent Change	-32	32	NMF[b]	9	-80	-88	-84	5
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County								
N 1975-76	5.75	35.5	--	41.25	.5	.5	1.0	42.25
N 1976-77	4.75	28.8	--	33.55	.25	--	.25	33.8
Percent Change	-17	-19	--	-19	-50	-100	-75	-20
Boston								
N 1975-76	281	341	--	622	22.7	23.1	45.8	667.8
N 1976-77	287	343	--	630	23.3	12.5	35.8	665.8
Percent Change	2	1	--	1	3	-46	-22	--
Houston								
N 1975-76	202	158	--	360	47	8.9	55.9	415.9
N 1976-77	194	121	--	315	53	5.3	58.3	373.3
Percent Change	-4	-23	--	-13	13	-40	4	-10
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock								
N 1975-76	10.1	55.1	--	65.2	1.0	1.8	2.8	68
N 1976-77	6.7	45.4	--	52.1	1.6	3.8	5.4	57.5
Percent Change	-33	-18	--	-20	60	111	93	-15
Yonkers								
N 1975-76	NA[c]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
N 1976-77	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Percent Change	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MEAN PERCENT CHANGES	14.0%	8.6%	NMF	13.9%	7.9%	35.9%	39.2%	15.3%

[a] Includes Resource Teachers who provide support to the teachers, but do not provide actual instruction to the students.

[b] NMF = No meaningful figure.

[c] NA = Data not available.

TABLE 3.7

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN ELEMENTARY FTE STUDENT/INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL RATIO

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76 FTE STUDENT/ INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL RATIO	1976-77 FTE STUDENT/ INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL RATIO	PERCENTAGE CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	1.7	4.0	135.3%
Harrison County	1.8	2.6	44.4
Mesa	2.3	2.7	17.4
Newport	1.6	1.8	-5.3
Racine	1.1	1.2	9.1
Santa Fe	2.8	2.9	3.6
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	3.0	3.9	30.0
Winston-Salem	2.8	4.8	71.4
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	1.1	2.0	81.8
Boston	2.7	2.4	- 11.1
Houston	7.1	7.3	2.8
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock	36.3	68.9	89.8
Yonkers	NA*	NA	NA
MEAN CHANGE			39.1%

*NA = Data not available.

ability to increase the number of FTE students per instructional staff are increases in class size (see Section 3.3) and increased staff utilization for direct instruction. (See Section 3.2.4.)

3.2.3 Changes in Instructional Staffing Patterns

One of the methods by which an LEA might have increased services delivered to students to an extent greater than the increase in expenditures is to shift compensatory instruction delivery from more expensive specialists to less expensive aides. This clearly did not take place at the elementary level. As Table 3.8 indicates, the ratio of specialists to total instructional personnel increased an average of 5.1% at the elementary level in 1976-77. (As Tables C-10 and C-11, Appendix C, show, principals confirm the stability of the use of specialists as primary deliverers of instruction.) The pervasiveness of this change is reflected by the fact that eight of the twelve LEAs show an increase in this ratio, including increases in Newport and Racine of 41.5% and 44.3%, respectively. Only four LEAs showed declines in the specialist/instructional personnel ratio.

3.2.4 Changes in Instructional Staff Utilization

Staff utilization may be measured by comparing the number of hours of direct instruction provided by the average specialist in 1975-76 to that provided in 1976-77. As Table 3.9 indicates, the number of hours of direct instruction provided by language arts specialists in the nine LEAs where information was available increased an average of 9.5%. Seven LEAs showed increases in the number of hours of direct instruction provided, while two LEAs showed slight declines. Thus, specialists, in general, increased their focus on providing direct instruction to students.

TABLE 3.8

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN ELEMENTARY SPECIALIST/TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL RATIO

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	1975-76 SPECIALIST/ INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL RATIO	1976-77 SPECIALIST/ INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL RATIO	PERCENTAGE CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	.583	.667	14.4%
Harrison County	.432	.495	-16.8
Mesa[a]	.000	.000	--
Newport	.521	.737	41.5
Racine	.167	.241	44.3
Santa Fe	.505	.424	-16.0
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	.516	.533	3.3
Winston-Salem	.374	.237	-36.6[b]
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	.139	.142	2.2
Boston	.452	.456	0.2
Houston	.561	.615	9.8
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock	.155	.129	-16.8
Yonkers	NA[c]	NA	NA
AVERAGE	.367	.390	5.1%

[a] Since Mesa's elementary Title I program did not employ specialists, the specialist/instructional personnel ratio is .000.

[b] Winston-Salem's decline in the specialist/instructional personnel ratio is tempered by the fact that five specialists were provided to the elementary Title I program by SAFA. Since Table 3.8 reflects only personnel purchased with Title I dollars, the 1976-77 specialist/instructional personnel ratio is thereby understated.

[c] NA = Data not available.

TABLE 3.9

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN DIRECT HOURS OF INSTRUCTION PROVIDED BY LANGUAGE ARTS SPECIALISTS

SOURCE: INSTRUCTIONAL SCHEDULES

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76 TOTAL HOURS DIRECT INSTRUCTION PER WEEK	1976-77 TOTAL HOURS DIRECT INSTRUCTION PER WEEK	PERCENTAGE CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	21.6	26.2	21.3%
Harrison County	21.7	22.8	5.1
Mesa	NA*	NA	--
Newport	18.3	17.8	- 2.7
Racine	12.4	14.4	16.1
Santa Fe	16.4	21.6	31.7
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	21.0	21.2	1.0
Winston-Salem	20.5	21.5	4.9
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	22.7	NA	--
Boston	21.5	21.4	- 0.5
Houston	21.8	23.7	8.7
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock	NA	NA	--
Yonkers	NA	NA	--
AVERAGE			9.5%

*NA = Data not available.

The increase in specialist utilization at the elementary level is all the more notable when we consider that the number of elementary specialists (and therefore, the number of specialists new to the Title I program) increased an average of 34% in 1976-77. If some of these additional specialists were first-time specialists, they would probably have required more inservice training and more preparation time than experienced specialists. Further, even experienced specialists new to the Title I program may have required familiarization with the instructional approaches and materials used in the program. Thus, we might have expected a decrease in staff utilization associated with the training of new specialists. The fact that specialists spent more time in direct instruction than before suggests that the districts made conscious decisions to increase staff utilization in order to provide more services to students without a concomitant increase in expenditures.*

3.2.5 Changes in Instructional Staff Qualifications

Generally, districts did not change in 1975-76 to less experienced compensatory instructional staff as a means of expanding services. As Table 3.10 shows, only four of the 13 Demonstration LEAs reported any notable ($\geq$1 year) decrease in the mean years of teaching experience for specialists, and these decreases were slight. Further, there was generally no notable difference between specialists and classroom teachers in mean years of experience in 1976-77. This suggests that as districts hired new specialists, they did not change their experience requirements.

---

*Since aides were not surveyed, to speculate on the change in aide utilization would be inappropriate. However, it is difficult to imagine an LEA taking steps to increase the utilization of specialists without doing likewise for aides.

TABLE 3.10

CHANGES IN MEAN YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
FOR COMPENSATORY SPECIALISTS AND CLASSROOM TEACHERS
FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: TEACHER BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	SPECIALISTS			CLASSROOM TEACHERS		
POLICY OPTION LEA	MEAN YEARS EXPERIENCE 1975-76	MEAN YEARS EXPERIENCE 1976-77	CHANGE	MEAN YEARS EXPERIENCE 1975-76	MEAN YEARS EXPERIENCE 1976-77	CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools						
Adams County #12	12.1	10.2	-1.9	9.5	9.8	0.3
Harrison County	10.6	7.2	-3.4	8.9	8.9	0.0
Mesa	10.0	11.7	1.7	13.3	12.0	-1.3
Newport	15.0	14.1	-0.9	10.6	12.3	1.7
Racine	9.1	9.4	0.3	11.5	12.9	1.4
Santa Fe	11.6	11.0	-0.6	13.9	12.9	-1.0
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries						
Charlotte	10.8	11.3	0.5	12.8	13.7	0.9
Winston-Salem	14.4	10.9	-3.5	13.7	13.2	-0.5
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty						
Berkeley County	7.6	3.0	-4.6	11.0	11.1	0.1
Boston	10.7	10.8	0.1	10.6	12.0	1.4
Houston	11.0	13.5	2.5	13.6	13.4	-0.2
Districts making primarily intra-school changes						
Alum Rock	17.8	19.1	1.3	13.3	14.6	1.3
Yonkers	13.7	15.9	2.2	10.5	8.9	-1.6
MEAN	11.9	11.4	-0.5	11.8	12.0	0.2

There was no systematic shift in the educational qualifications of specialists over time. As shown in Table 3.11, in four districts there was a notable (>10%) increase in the percentage of specialists with a B.A. degree or less, in 1976-77, while in two others there was a notable decrease. The remainder of the districts showed little change. The educational qualifications of classroom teachers remained fairly stable as well, with only three districts showing notable shifts in the percentage of teachers with B.A.s or less. Generally, the pattern for 1976-77 resembled that for 1975-76. Specialists had generally a higher level of educational attainment than classroom teachers, although the gap narrowed in 1976-77. This suggests that as districts hired new specialists, they did not change their experience or educational requirements. Specialists continue to have over 10 years of teaching experience behind them and half of these specialists have attained education beyond the B.A. degree.

3.2.6 Staff Training

Table 3.12 is useful in examining two aspects of staff training which may have been important in allowing districts to train the rather large number of "new" specialists (see Section 3.2.4) without increasing staff development costs. These are:

- the number of schools conducting staff training sessions and,
- the type of persons initiating these training sessions.

It is clear that, with the exception of Newport and Alum Rock, training sessions were conducted in more schools, as might be expected. Such an increase in training sessions might serve to increase staff development costs. However, such costs might be countered by increasing the involvement of in-school personnel and decreasing the involvement of district and/or outside persons in conducting training sessions.

TABLE 3.11

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN LEVEL OF EDUCATION FOR COMPENSATORY SPECIALISTS AND CLASSROOM TEACHERS

DATA SOURCE: TEACHER BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	SPECIALISTS			CLASSROOM TEACHERS		
	PERCENT WITH B.A. OR LESS			PERCENT WITH B.A. OR LESS		
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76	1976-77	Change	1975-76	1976-77	-Change
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools						
Adams County #12	50.0%	33.3%	-16.7%	85.5%	79.0%	-6.5%
Harrison County	63.1	66.7	3.6	79.7	68.3	-11.4
Mesa	21.5	36.4	14.9	39.1	46.9	7.8
Newport	36.3	25.0	-11.3	80.0	73.1	-6.9
Racine	72.2	72.7	0.5	[illegible]	81.4	-3.4
Santa Fe	0.0	40.0	40.0	[illegible]2.2	66.2	-6.0
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries						
Charlotte	73.4	71.8	-1.6	72.2	80.8	8.6
Winston-Salem	66.6	65.0	-1.6	86.8	75.1	-11.7
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty						
Berkeley County	71.4	100.0	28.6	83.6	84.4	0.8
Boston	45.1	50.6	5.5	51.3	44.7	-6.6
Houston	57.7	54.0	-3.7	68.4	66.7	-1.7
Districts making primarily intra-school changes						
Alum Rock	18.2	55.6	37.4	79.7	80.0	0.3
Yonkers	6.3	0.0	-6.3	41.5	25.0	-16.5
MEAN	44.8%	51.6%	6.9%	71.1%	67.0%	-4.1%

TABLE 3.12

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS THAT PROVIDE COMPENSATORY STAFF TRAINING SESSIONS, AND TYPE OF PERSONS INITIATING THESE SESSIONS

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION		NUMBER OF SCHOOLS RESPONDING*		CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS PROVIDING TRAINING SESSIONS	OF THOSE PROVIDING TRAINING SESSIONS, CHANGE IN MEAN PERCENTAGE OF TRAINING SESSIONS INITIATED BY:		
POLICY OPTION	LEA	75-76	76-77		IN-SCHOOL PERSONNEL	DISTRICT PERSONNEL	OTHERS
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
	Adams County #12	12	16	45.8	-24.2	43.3	-19.2
	Harrison County	29	30	8.1	- 1.1	3.7	- 2.6
	Mesa	19	20	7.9	22.4	-27.1	4.8
	Newport	10	10	-20.0	26.4	-30.7	4.4
	Racine	24	27	1.7	- 9.1	6.1	3.0
	Santa Fe	16	16	6.3	9.5	3.6	5.9
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
	Charlotte	67	56	5.2	0.1	- 0.7	0.6
	Winston-Salem	37	25	47.5	9.2	-12.6	3.3
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
	Berkeley County	11	11	18.1	6.6	- 5.0	- 1.6
	Boston	74	76	22.8	- 1.1	- 0.5	1.5
	Houston	119	47	15.6	1.8	2.2	- 3.9
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
	Alum Rock	12	17	-27.0	12.7	-13.7	1.0
	Yonkers	25	24	21.5	-35.0	35.0	0.0

*Includes both Title I and non-Title I schools.

As shown by Table 3.12, five districts (Mesa, Newport, Santa Fe, Winston-Salem, and Alum Rock) did indeed increase the use of in-school personnel by a notable amount. Of these, four (all except Santa Fe) also reduced somewhat the use of district personnel to conduct training sessions. As shown in Table C-12 (Appendix C), however, the districts continued to rely heavily on such personnel to initiate training sessions during the Demonstration. Thus, we must conclude that districts were able to increase training sessions without increasing staff development costs by some means other than changing the personnel who initiated these sessions.

Other training activities, such as teacher observation of other classrooms and college course tuition payments, do appear to have been reduced. As Table 3.13 shows, such activities generally showed a decline in the first implementation year.* Tables C-14 and C-15 show that the emphasis of the school-initiated sessions changed very little during this year, however.

---

*Data for 1976-77 are displayed in Table C-13, Appendix C.

Table 3.13

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS OFFERING COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROJECTS IN WHICH TEACHERS PARTICIPATED IN A VARIETY OF OTHER SCHOOL-INITIATED STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	OVERALL N		TYPE OF ACTIVITY					
POLICY OPTION LEA	75-76	76-77	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF VISITS TO CLASSROOM BY TRAINEES	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS OBSERVING OTHER CLASSES	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF STAFF/ SPECIALISTS CONSULTATIONS	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF STAFF EXCHANGE PROGRAMS	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF STAFF MEETINGS	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF COLLEGE COURSES
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	4	16	12.5	25.0	-12.5	6.3	6.3	6.3
Harrison County	23	30	15.3	18.5	9.4	-47.2	7.1	- 1.0
Mesa	18	20	-35.5	-30.0	-33.9	3.9	- 7.2	3.3
Newport	9	10	-37.8	18.9	56.7	-11.1	34.4	-12.2
Racine	22	27	-11.7	-23.3	-20.6	6.6	-20.8	8.6
Santa Fe	16	16	-18.7	6.2	- 6.3	-18.7	-12.5	0.0
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	46	56	- 9.8	-15.4	0.9	-20.1	4.9	- 7.3
Winston-Salem	25	25	- 8.0	-16.0	4.0	16.0	8.0	- 4.0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	7	11	-15.5	- 1.3	- 2.5	-19.5	-49.3	0.0
Boston	43	76	12.2	- 2.8	9.7	-10.7	- 7.6	2.2
Houston	80	47	- 4.7	30.7	2.6	- 6.0	- 1.8	- 0.4
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	12	17	8.8	-10.3	-27.1	- 4.9	- 5.9	2.0
Yonkers	15	24	- 1.7	-34.2	-21.7	-20.8	1.7	8.3

3.3 Changes in Program Operations

In addition to altering the mix and distribution of activities and staffing, districts may have made changes in certain aspects of program operations in order to expand services. For example, districts might have moved away from the pull-out model of instruction, which requires the establishment and maintenance of labs and/or resource rooms. Such rooms tend to be more costly than in-class approaches to instruction. Additionally, districts may have made changes in the scheduling of instruction as services expanded under the Demonstration. Finally, districts might have increased class size in order to serve more students without increasing staff proportionally. This section examines changes in these three aspects of program operations.

3.3.1 Location of Instruction

Overall, principals reported very little change under the Demonstration in the location of instruction for Title I language arts.* Instruction continued to be located outside the regular classroom in a lab or learning center the great majority of the time. (See Tables C-16, Appendix C.) Seven LEAs (Mesa, Charlotte, Berkeley County, Boston, Houston, Winston-Salem, and Yonkers) did report some intensification of the trend to locate Title I instruction outside the regular classroom (i.e., in a room set aside or in a laboratory/learning center). These principal reports were consistent with the district administrator reports obtained during our site visits.

In sum, it is clear that districts chose to maintain the already predominant pull-out model of instruction as they expanded services under the Demonstration. Possible factors influencing this choice are discussed in Section 4.2.

---

*Since so few districts operated math programs, math is not discussed.

3.3.2 Instructional Class Size

As noted in Section 3.0, we have three data sources through which we can explore changes in instructional class size: program administrators, instructional specialists, and principals. While these data sources generally substantiate one another, contradictions, particularly between program administrators and instructional specialists, do exist for some districts. These contradictions are of two types: differences in direction and differences in magnitude. For example, administrators might report a 30% increase in class size while instructional specialits report a 20% decrease. Or, administrators might report a 20% increase in class size while specialists report a 10% increase. Differences of both types may be attributed to one or more of the following factors:

- different data collection methods, i.e., personal interviews versus self-administered questionnaires;
- different dates of administration, i.e., spring versus fall;
- different respondent samples, i.e., program administrators (planners) versus program specialists (implementors); and
- different parts of the delivery system represented, i.e., program administrators describe all program deliverers including aides whereas specialists describe only their view of program delivery.

While it is not our intent to dwell on these differences, some attention must be given to their resolution. Generally, we have felt that magnitudinal differences and small directional differences do not present serious problems in interpreting general patterns concerning decreases and increases. Substantial directional differences present more serious problems, however. Where these occur, site-specific

factors have been taken into account to aid in interpretation of the data. Finally, in those few cases where only one data source is available, we have assumed it to be representative and adequate for interpretation.

Instructional class size data from program administrators and instructional specialists are presented in Table 3.14. (Data from principals are presented in Table C-17 and C-18, Appendix C.) Looking at Table 3.14, we see that one district, Santa Fe, had a substantial directional difference between specialists and program administrators. Since this LEA makes heavy use of aides as program deliverers, we have chosen to consider the administrator data as more representative since administrators provide an overview of both specialist and aide program delivery.

While there are magnitudinal differences between specialists and administrator data, consistent general patterns are clear. These may be summarized as follows:

- First, according to both administrators and specialists, six LEAs increased class size for language arts instruction; four LEAs decreased class size.
- Second, the percent increase in class size in the six LEAs which increased class size was more than three times greater than the percent decrease in the four LEAs which decreased class size for both data sets.
- Third, the average increase in language arts class size was 24.1% according to administration data, and 14.7% according to specialist data.

Closer examination of the actual numbers of students (in contrast to the percentage change) reveals that, with the exceptions of Berkeley County and Alum Rock, LEAs did not increase or decrease instructional class size by more than three students. In addition, with the exception of Adams County #12, no district changed its

TABLE 3.14

PERCENT CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77
IN LANGUAGE ARTS CLASS SIZE*

DATA SOURCE: SITE DESCRIPTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONAL SCHEDULE
SAMPLE: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS AND INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS			INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALISTS		
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76	1976-77	% CHANGE	1975-76	1976-77	% CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools						
Adams County #12	4	6	50.0	NA**	5.6	NA
Harrison County	8	10	25.0	5.6	5.8	3.6
Mesa	5	5	0	NA	NA	NA
Newport	6	5	-16.6	5.3	4.3	-17.3
Racine	2	4	100.0	4.8	5.0	4.2
Santa Fe	9	6	-33.3	3.3	5.9	81.3
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries						
Charlotte	8	7	-12.5	8.3	7.7	- 7.2
Winston-Salem	14	15	7.1	12.5	14.2	13.6
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty						
Berkeley County	4	9	125.0	4.4	7.3	65.9
Boston	7	7	0	7.5	7.2	- 4.0
Houston	5	8	60.0	11.5	12.0	4.3
Districts making primarily intra-school changes						
Alum Rock	24	20	-16.6	NA	19.8	NA
Yonkers	NA	NA	NA	16.0	14.8	- 7.5
MEAN	--	--	24.1	--	--	14.7

*Too few districts operated Title I math program to permit cross-site interpretation. Therefore, math data are omitted.

**NA = Data not available.

instructional grouping pattern, e.g., shifted from a small group (2-5 students) to a medium (6 to 10 students) or large (>10 students) group.* Furthermore, even in Adams County #12, it is not clear that a change from 4 to 6 students implies a change in mode of instruction. As Tables C-17 and C-18 show, principal data support this finding of lack of change from an educational perspective.

In sum, we find that, overall, LEAs increased instructional class size under the Demmonstration. While the increases were generally small and not notable from an educational perspective, they nevertheless may have played a significant role in allowing districts to expand services.

3.3.3 Scheduling of Instruction

In reorganizing services under the Demonstration, districts may have manipulated one or more scheduling variables. These are minutes of instruction per day, days of instruction per week, and weeks of instruction per year. Obviously, multiplying these three variables yields a measure of the total amount of instruction received by a student in a year. This measure can be used to calculate service and, in fact, drawing upon the program administrator data, was so used.** However, at this point in our report, we are not interested in examining change in the amount of service overall but in describing which individual scheduling variables districts manipulated as they increased service under the Demonstration. For example, we are interested in exploring whether districts decreased minutes of instruction per day while increasing days per week and weeks per year.

---

*These classifications of class size are consistent with those used in the Classroom Activities Log (CAL). For discussion of the CAL, see James J. Vanecko, Francis X. Archambault, and Nancy L. Ames, ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Analysis of Baseline Data, Volume I (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., October 31, 1977).

**See Chapter 2.0.

In other words, we are interested in seeing if and how districts rescheduled instruction under the Demonstration.

We have two sources of data that allow us to explore this issue, i.e., program administrator data and principal data. However, as for the data on instructional class size, our data sources conflict. The conflict is far more serious in the case of the scheduling variables. Because program administrators have a more intimate view of the program, we have chosen to rely upon these data alone in our interpretations. (Principal data are, however, reported in Table C-19, Appendix C.)

As Table 3.15 shows, districts did not appear to consistently manipulate any one of the three scheduling variables. For example, program administrators in Racine, Santa Fe, and Alum Rock indicate that the minutes of instruction per day were manipulated while other scheduling variables remained stable. In contrast, Mesa and Newport held minutes per day constant while manipulating weeks per year and both days per week and weeks per year, respectively.

However, districts did seem generally less inclined to alter the number of days per week instruction was offered than either minutes per day or weeks per year. Of the 12 districts for which data are available, only three districts manipulated the former, while seven and eight manipulated the latter (respectively). Further, it is interesting to note that only one district, Charlotte, did not manipulate any of the three scheduling variables.

In sum, we see that almost all districts made some changes in the scheduing of instruction under the Demonstration. The type of change varied by district and no consistent pattern across the three variables emerged. Districts did tend, however, to change days per week less than minutes per day or weeks per year.

Table 3.15

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN TITLE I LANGUAGE ARTS SCHEDULING VARIABLES

DATA SOURCE: SITE DESCRIPTIONS
SAMPLE: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	MINUTES PER DAY			DAYS PER WEEK			WEEKS PER YEAR		
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76	1976-77	% Change	1975-76	1976-77	% Change	1975-76	1976-77	% Change
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools									
Adams County #12	35	30	-14	5	5	0	16	24	50
Harrison County	23	26	13	4	4	0	36	38	6
Mesa	25	25	0	5	5	0	18	16	-11
Newport	30	30	0	5	4	-20	36	38	6
Racine	51	30	-41	4	4	0	36	36	0
Santa Fe	40	30	-25	4	4	0	32	32	0
Districts that rank schools by achievement ans serve fewer than all elementaries									
Charlotte	38	38	0	5	5	0	36	36	0
Winston-Salem	50	45	-1	5	5	0	34	36	6
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty									
Berkeley County	28	30	7	3	5	67	36	20	-44
Boston	45	45	0	5	5	0	36	32	-11
Houston	38	38	0	4	5	25	36	34	-6
Districts making primarily intra-school changes									
Alum Rock	105	68	-35	5	5	0	36	36	0
Yonkers	45	NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MEAN	--	--	-8%	--	--	6%	--	--	-0.3%

*NA = Data not available.

3.4 Individualization of Instruction

In addition to changing activities, staffing patterns, and operations, districts may have changed their instructional approaches under waivers. This section focuses on the changes that occurred under the Demonstration in the degree of individualization of language arts instruction.* Comparisons are made between the degree of individualization in the instruction provided by regular classroom teachers and by compensatory specialists.

Information on the individualization of compensatory and regular language arts instruction received by Title I students was obtained from Program Description Modules. These self-administered questionnaires were completed by both regular classroom teachers of sample children and by compensatory instructional specialists. (All compensatory instructional specialists from all funding sources in all elementary schools were sampled.)**

In our analysis of these data, we have taken two approaches. First, we have constructed an "Individually Prescribed Activities and Materials Scale," which reflects the frequency with which respondents assign tasks to and work with small groups and utilize individualized teaching materials. (See Table C-20 for scale items.) This scale provides an assessment of the general level of individualization of instruction within each respondent group. Second, to provide a more detailed picture of the changes in various practices related to individualization (e.g., use of

---

*Due to the small sizes of the compensatory mathematics programs in the districts and, therefore, the small number of sample students receiving such instruction, a detailed analysis for mathematics has not been conducted.

**For a more detailed discussion of sampling and instrumentation see James J. Vanecko, et al., ESEA Title I Demonstration Study--Implementation Decisions and Research Plan (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., December 9, 1977).

performance objectives, utilization of materials), we have examined the responses of both teachers and specialists to a number of questions about these practices.

Table 3.16 displays the mean scores of compensatory language arts specialists on the Individually Prescribed Activities and Materials Scale. The higher the value on this scale, the more frequently teachers assign tasks to and work with small groups, and the more frequently they utilize individualized teaching materials. In all districts in both years there was a high level of individualization as measured by the scale.* Across years, only two districts showed significant changes on this measure. Berkeley County specialists showed a significant increase in individualization, and Mesa specialists showed a significant decrease.

The Berkeley County change appears to reflect the emphasis placed on standardization of the Title I program and the movement towards individualization initiated by this district during the first implementation year. Prior to 1976-77, there were no district-wide procedures for student selection. Schools administered different tests and relied heavily on teacher referral. Nor was there a standardized approach to program operation. Class size and scheduling decisions were made at the school level.

During the planning year, the district selected a single achievement test to be used in student selection, upgraded their criterion referenced tests, and worked toward promoting more individualized instruction in the reading/math labs. In addition to standardizing student selection procedures and program operations, a better record-keeping system was developed to keep track of both time spent in the labs and student progress.

---

*Scores on this scale were standardized so that a score of 50 represents the 1975-76 baseline year mean of site means for both specialists and regular classroom teachers. Given a standard deviation of 10, specialists in almost all sites are at least one standard deviation above this mean in both years.

Table 3.16

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN MEAN SCORE OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS SPECIALISTS ON THE INDIVIDUALLY PRESCRIBED ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS SCALE

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	62.09	61.10	-.99
Harrison County	62.13	61.71	-.42
Mesa	57.85	52.80	-5.05*
Newport	66.60	66.18	-.42
Racine	66.55	69.68	3.13
Santa Fe	60.11	59.18	-.93
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	70.14	70.68	.54
Winston-Salem	75.00	72.54	-2.46
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	64.61	74.90	10.29*
Boston	60.64	60.21	-.43
Houston	67.40	68.06	.66
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock	60.45	66.78	6.33
Yonkers	64.52	66.12	1.60
AVERAGE	64.47	65.38	.91

*Change significant at the .05 level.

During the first implementation year, these procedures were put into operation. Students were tested continually with criterion referenced tests to determine mastery of skills. Logs were kept recording time spent in the labs, as well as pupil progress charts recording skills mastered. Upon mastery, the students moved back into the classroom.

The finding for Mesa, on the other hand, is not as easy to explain. In both years, specialists in this district scored lower on this scale than those in other districts. In Mesa, specialists serve primarily as resource teachers, with aides providing most of the direct instruction to Title I students. It is possible that in this capacity they are less apt to diagnose and prescribe activities for individual students than to identify curricular materials and teaching stratgies for teachers and aides.

Turning now to regular language arts instruction received by Title I students, Table 3.17 displays the mean scores for regular language arts instructors on the Individually Prescribed Activities and Materials Scale. Comparison with Table 3.16 shows that the amount of individualization in regular instruction was less than that in compensatory instruction for all districts in both years.

All of the changes in individualization between the implementation and baseline years were relatively small. Only Alum Rock showed a significant change, a decrease of approximately four points. Since there were no planned changes in instructional approach in this district, this finding is difficult to interpret.

In summary, based on the scale findings, it appears that there were few changes in the extent to which compensatory or regular instruction was individualized. Specialists continued to report a higher level of individualization than did regular classroom teachers. Specialists in

Table 3.17

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN MEAN SCORE OF REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTORS OF TITLE I STUDENTS ON THE INDIVIDUALLY PRESCRIBED ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS SCALE

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	1975-76	1976-77	CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	46.54	48.09	1.55
Harrison County	45.86	45.53	-0.33
Mesa	50.20	48.36	-1.84
Newport	--	50.22	--
Racine	45.81	44.86	-0.95
Santa Fe	52.72	52.32	-0.40
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	50.62	51.01	0.39
Winston-Salem	48.21	46.69	-1.52
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	46.07	42.07	-4.00
Boston	49.90	47.01	-2.89
Houston	47.59	47.61	0.02
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock	55.32	51.33	-3.99*
Yonkers	53.08	55.65	2.57
AVERAGE	49.33	48.52	-.95

*Change significant at the .05 level.

only one district, Berkeley County, appeared to have moved dramatically in the direction of increased individualization of instruction over time. Specialists in Mesa and teachers in Alum Rock, on the other hand, revealed small but significant shifts in the opposite direction across years.

In addition to the planned changes in Berkeley County, which were reflected in specialsts' reports on individualization, at least one other district attempted a major change in instructional approach. In Yonkers' Demonstration schools, both reading and math labs employed an "Individualized Diagnostic Prescriptive Program" in which an individual student's needs were identified, and particular instruction for those needs was selected. Entire classes or large groups of children received services, in order to reduce the stigma of being pulled out of the regular classroom for remedial instruction. Often lab classes contained both Title I and non-Title I students. In such classes, Title I students received remedial instruction, while non-Title I students pursued independent or group activities prescribed by their classroom teacher.

While no significant change was observed among Yonkers' specialists or regular teachers, based on self-report, in both cases there was a slight move toward greater individualization. It should also be pointed out that Yonkers' allocation policy included only four Demonstration schools, in contrast to nine Title I schools in the entire district. Thus, if there were significant changes within the Demonstration schools, this might be obscured by the large number of non-Demonstration teachers in the analysis sample.

Data on specialists' individualization practices are presented in Table 3.18, which summarizes the by-site responses of compensatory language arts teachers to several detailed questions concerning their instructional approaches, i.e.,

TABLE 3.18

CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN
DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION
IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS

DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES

INSTRUCTIONAL CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENT OF COMPENSATORY TEACHERS EMPLOYING CHARACTERISTICS 1976-77*		CHANGE FROM 1975-76 to 1976-77 IN PERCENT
	Range	Median	
1. Measures used to assess performance level at beginning of instruction:			
Standardized achievement test scores	18.2 - 100.0	86.5	1.9
Standardized diagnostic test scores	9.1 - 100.0	75.9	16.8
Scores on district-, school-, or program-developed tests keyed to instructional objectives	39.4 - 100.0	62.5	-1.1
Scores on teaching staff-developed tests keyed to instructional objectives	25.8 - 75.0	42.9	-9.3
Informal testing	40.0 - 100.0	83.8	-1.0
Previous year's grades	4.5 - 63.5	33.3	2.0
Student's age	7.1 - 40.0	18.2	-4.5
2. Use of performance objectives:			
Specific performance objectives used	68.0 - 100.0	89.5	3.1
Of those using specific objectives, goals are set for:			
Each child	47.0 - 100.0	82.1	15.4
Small groups	0.0 - 26.3	13.2	-6.4
Total group	0.0 - 31.0	8.3	-5.0
Of those using specific objectives, objectives are based on:			
Content	0.0 - 33.3	6.3	-2.8
Level of mastery	0.0 - 26.7	10.6	-0.5
Both	58.3 - 90.9	80.0	3.1
Of those using specific objectives, access to materials keyed to those objectives	57.9 - 100.0	92.8	1.9
3. How are tasks assigned:			
To whole class	9.0 - 62.1	19.7	-7.2
To small groups	6.8 - 37.7	21.7	-3.7
To individual students	24.8 - 81.3	55.5	11.9
4. How materials are utilized:			
Same materials, same order, same rate	0.0 - 26.7	1.9	-0.3
Same materials, same order, different rate	6.3 - 42.2	18.7	-6.6
Same materials, different sequence	11.6 - 46.2	22.5	10.0
Different materials for different children	15.6 - 81.3	53.5	5.3
5. Measures used to assess students' progress during the year:			
Review homework/workbooks	0.0 - 26.3	10.4	10.4
Scores on objectives referenced tests	17.6 - 93.8	58.3	-3.2
Class participation	0.0 - 41.2	16.7	-1.8
Student self-evaluation	0.0 - 10.5	1.5	1.5
6. Methods of recording students' progress			
Folders	80.0 - 100.0	95.4	4.5
Flow charts	9.1 - 81.3	31.9	8.4
Record forms provided with materials	41.2 - 93.4	67.4	-1.8
Computer tracking system	0.0 - 24.4	5.1	5.1
7. Frequency of recording students' progress	0.0 - 50.0	19.0	3.0
5 times a week	0.0 - 50.0	19.0	3.0
1-4 times a week	22.2 - 57.8	35.7	-7.2
1-3 times a month	10.2 - 75.0	31.0	5.2
Less than 1-3 times a month	0.0 - 28.0	5.3	-1.5

*Data for 1975-76 are presented in James J. Vanecko, et al., ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Results of the First Year Implementation (Cambridge, Mass: Abt Associates Inc., March 30, 1978).

- the use of diagnostic procedures (Item 1);
- the use of individually prescribed objectives, activities, and materials (Items 2, 3, and 4); and
- the use of evaluation and feedback activities (Items 5, 6, and 7).*

Generally, compensatory language arts specialists in all 13 Demonstration districts reported a high level of use of practices related to individualizing instruction in 1976-77, as they had in 1975-76. However, some caution must be exercised in interpreting these results, which may have been affected by the general nature of the questions asked and by positive response bias. Changes, which are based on percent of specialists responding in the baseline versus the first implementation year, are somewhat more marked than those found on the individualization scale. Several findings are both notable and interesting.

Across sites, specialists reported using a number of measures to assess performance level at the beginning of the school year. Standardized achievement tests, diagnostic tests, and/or informal testing procedures were employed by more than three-quarters of the specialists. Use of standardized diagnostic test scores increased 17% in 1976-77. The changes here generally show a move away from teacher judgement in assessing initial performance level, toward use of standardized measures for such assessment. Only Mesa revealed a dramatic (43%) shift away from use of such tests.

---

*By-site specialist responses are presented in Tables C-21 and C-22, Appendix C. Summarized responses and by-site responses for regular teachers are presented in Tables C-23 through C-25, respectively. Since there are few, if any, changes in regular teachers' practices between 1975-76 and 1976-77 and since the level of use of individualized practices for teachers is generally lower than for specialists (as for the scale), we have omitted discussion of regular teachers' practices.

Over 89% of the compensatory language specialists (3% more than the baseline year) reported using specific performance objectives. Of these, 80% reported that they set objectives for individual students, an increase of 15% over 1976-77. In both years, the majority of specialists reported that performance objectives were based on both content and level of mastery. They also reported having access to materials keyed to performance objectives. There was virtually no change over time in these practices, with the possible exception of Santa Fe, in which fewer specialists reported using these approaches, and Adams County #12 and Racine, which increased their use of both criteria.

Individualized task assignment and differential sequencing of materials was widespread, although not universal. There was a 12% overall increase in assignment of tasks to individual students. As Table C-21 shows, the largest increase was found in Berkeley County (30%). When assigning materials, most compensatory language arts specialists reported using different materials with different children. In 1976-77, 5% more specialists used materials in this way. Others were more apt to assign the same materials, but in differing sequences for different students. Overall utilization of this type of assignment increased 10%. As Table C-21 shows, all districts except Mesa and Santa Fe moved away from using the same materials in the same order, but at different rates.

With respect to evaluation/feedback activities, compensatory specialists reported objective-referenced tests as a frequent means of assessing student progress in Demonstration sites. However, in 1976-77, most districts slightly decreased their use of such tests. One exception was Berkeley County, which showed a 36% increase in use of objective-referenced tests. Review of homework and workbook assignments

had the largest increase relative to other means of assessing student progress. The overall increase was 10%. Student folders were the most favored means of recording progress, with a small increase in the percentage of specialists using this method. In addition, the records accompanying instructional materials were used by 67% of the teachers. Berkeley County and Newport both increased their use of computer tracking systems to record students' progress.

Finally, student progress was typically recorded one to four times a week, although fewer specialists in 1976-77 recorded progress with this frequency. The changes from the baseline year show that increases were made in both daily recording of progress and in the category of one to three times a month.

3.5 Coordination of Compensatory Programs

As discussed in previous reports, the coordination of compensatory programs was a high priority in the majority of the Demonstration districts prior to the Demonstration itself.* Furthermore, our 1975-76 site visits revealed that five LEAs--Newport, Adams County #12, Berkeley County, Houston, and Racine--saw greater integration of programs not only as a way of increasing the effectiveness of the total compensatory effort but also as an important tool for expanding elementary services under the Demonstration. (Interestingly, all five of these LEAs had considerable coordination of compensatory programs in 1975-76.)

These five sites did indeed make changes in program coordination under the Demonstration. In all five instances,

---

*James J. Vanecko, Francis X. Archambault, and Nancy L. Ames, ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Analysis of Baseine Data, Volumes I and II (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., October 31, 1977).

Table 3.19

MODELS OF PROGRAM COORDINATION*

1975-76	1976-77 Integrated Model	1976-77 Sequenced Model
Integrated Model	Berkeley County Alum Rock Yonkers Mesa	Adams County #12
Sequenced Model	Newport	Houston Racine

*Boston, Charlotte, and Santa Fe are omitted from this table because the degree of coordination among programs was low in both 1975-76 and 1976-77. Harrison County is omitted because Title I was the only compensatory program extant in 1976-77. Winston-Salem is excluded because Title I was the only extant compensatory program in 1975-76. (However, in 1976-77 the state-funded kindergarten program, which served all types of students, absorbed the Title I kindergartens, thereby freeing Title I funds for elementary expansion. Thus, Winston-Salem might be said to have used the Sequence Model for program coordination in 1976-77.)

district administrators reported that coordination had been tightened from an administrative perspective. Given the limits of our study, it is impossible to quantify the degree to which coordination was tightened. However, it is possible, and perhaps even more interesting, to examine the approaches to or models of coordination used by these five districts, as well as by other Demonstration LEAs.

As Table 3.19 shows, two models of coordination were used by those eight districts that reported notable coordination in both 1975-76 and 1976-77. These are the Integrated Model and the Sequenced Model. The Integrated Model is essentially an approach that, at the school level, operationally merges two or more programs into what is generally regarded by staff as a single program. Funds are of course administered separately, but, for all practical purposes, there is little or no operational distinction among the programs.

Berkeley County provides a good illustration of the Integrated Model. In this district, Title I and ESAA funds are used to establish reading/math laboratories in the elementary schools. Prior to the Demonstration where a school was eligible for Title I, Title I funds were used to establish the lab. Where a school was ineligible for Title I, ESAA funds were used. The ESAA and Title I labs were and are indistinguishable in practice, both in terms of services offered and types of children served.

In contrast to the Integrated Model, the Sequenced Model is an approach that closely coordinates two or more clearly distinguishable programs. Programs might be distinguishable on one or more of several dimensions. For example, a Title I program might serve disadvantaged students in grades 1-3, offering instruction appropriate to these grade levels. In comparison, a sequenced State compensatory program might serve disadvantaged students in grades 4-6,

thereby continuing some level of service to Title I-type students through the upper elementary grades. The important point is that the district administration coordinates the two programs carefully so that they complement each other and more students receive a more complete range of compensatory services than possible with one program alone.

Houston provides a good illustration of the Sequenced Model. In Houston, Title I and state compensatory (SCE) programs are coordinated in this manner. Presently, Title I provides compensatory services to elementary students; SCE, to secondary students. District administrators report that the two programs are planned and designed to provide continuous service through both the elementary and secondary years to disadvantaged students. The LEA administrative staff view this approach as a means of insuring that disadvantaged students are not simply "dropped" before they are able to function in the regular classroom.

As noted previously, under the Demonstration, five LEAs made changes in coordination. Three of these--Berkeley County, Houston, and Racine--continued their use of the model applied prior to the Demonstration and simply increased the degree of coordination in effect. Briefly, Berkeley County continued the operation of its ESAA and Title I labs and expanded the grades served by the ESAA labs to duplicate those served by the Title I labs. In 1975-76, ESAA labs had served grades 3 and 6; Title I labs, grades 1-6. In 1976-77, both labs served grades 2-5.

Houston in 1975-76 had used SCE funds (which were considerably less than in 1976-77) in a rather "odds-and-ends" fashion to provide services similar to Title I to non-Title I elementary students. In 1976-77, Houston sequenced the two programs to serve elementary and secondary levels, respectively. (A substantial increase in the size of the SCE effort helped to make this approach feasible.)

In 1976-77, Racine accepted ESAA funds for the first time. (Although eligible for ESAA, Racine had previously refused to accept the funds.) In 1975-76, Racine had used the Sequenced Model to coordinate Title I with a small state compensatory program. Continuing with this model, Racine used the ESAA program to provide secondary services formerly provided by Title I. This freed Title I funds for an elementary expansion.

In contrast to Berkeley County, Houston, and Racine, two districts--Adams County #12 and Newport--changed coordination models under the Demonstration. In 1975-76, Adams County #12 used the Integrated Model. Essentially, a local compensatory effort was used to supplement the Title I program. This local effort was regarded as a sort of "informal" compensatory program. In 1976-77, the Demonstration provided a significant stimulus for the district to switch to the Sequenced Model. The local compensatory effort was formalized into a program serving grades 4-12. Title I funds were concentrated in grades 1-3. District administrators reported that the philosophy underlying this restructuring was that the Title I program could "catch" and remediate disadvantaged children with educational problems in the early grades. The local program could then provide services to those children who continued to need them through the upper elementary and secondary grades.

Newport changed from the Sequenced Model to the Integrated Model under the Demonstration. In 1975-76, the Newport Title I program had served grades 4-12 while the state/local compensatory program, Section IV, had served grades 1-3. The primary rationale for this structure revolved around the 1975-76 pattern of school eligibility for Title I service in Newport. Under the Demonstration, Newport chose the direct allocation option and services were

thus no longer confined by school eligibility requirements. Consequently, Newport chose to expand Title I services to grades 1-12 and make Section IV funds available for use by the Title I program.

3.6 Summary

In Chapter 2, we discussed the fact that many of the Demonstration districts increased the amount of service received by Title I elementary students. In part, this increase was suported by an increase in total dollars for such instruction and by a change in the manner in which these dollars were used. However, these fiscal factors did not account entirely for the expansion of service.

This chapter describes changes in program delivery patterns which accompanied the allocation policy changes. Generally, the picture is one of stability. Districts did focus their Title I programs more on elementary instruction, modify coordination with other compensatory programs, and change staffing patterns somewhat. Several also increased specialist utilization and class size, although the latter change was not of educational importance.

Although these changes did not alter greatly the mode in which instruction was delivered, they did, in many instances, help support Title I program expansion. Table 3.20 summarizes for each of the Demonstration districts the change in elementary service, the change in elementary expenditures, and the difference between the two. Five districts appear to have large differences (greater than 30%) between the service and expenditure figures--Adams County #12, Racine, Winston-Salem, Berkeley County, and Alum Rock. Some portion of these discrepancies can be accounted for by programmatic changes.

Adams County #12, for example, had a large increase in service relative to expenditures, which also increased

TABLE 3.20

COMPARISON OF CHANGES FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77
IN SERVICES AND IN EXPENDITURES FOR
TITLE I ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	PERCENT CHANGE IN SERVICES	PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES	DIFFERENCE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			
Adams County #12	369%	93%	276%
Harrison County	51	41	10
Mesa	11	-2	13
Newport	87	112	-25
Racine	17	90	-73
Santa Fe	23	10	13
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries			
Charlotte	20	1	19
Winston-Salem	87	55	32
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty			
Berkeley County	44	2	42
Boston	-12	11	-23
Houston	-10	18	-28
Districts making primarily intra-school changes			
Alum Rock	52	-2	54
Yonkers	NA*	-27	NA

*NA = Data not available.

dramatically. While not fully accounting for the difference, the fact that both staff utilization and class size increased may help to explain this district's ability to expand service.

Racine, on the other hand, showed a small decrease in service relative to expenditures. The shift to more expensive specialists, instead of aides, may account, in part, for this difference.

Winston-Salem also increased service without a concomitant increase in expenditures. As discussed in Chapter 2, this increase was supported partly by a shift to the use of audio-visual equipment in lieu of personnel. In addition, increases in staff utilization and class size helped increase the amount of service provided in this district. Finally, a decrease in the specialist/aide ratio served the objective of program expansion.

Berkeley County and Alum Rock both showed an increase in service with virtually no change in Title I expenditures. It appears that a large increase in class size made expansion possible in Berkeley County. The service increase in Alum Rock is less easy to explain. Given the consolidated nature of the compensatory programs in this district, it is difficult to assign Title I (or other) dollars to a specific set of services. One program change which may have been a factor is the decline in the specialist/aide ratio.

4.0 IMPLEMENTATION

Thus far in this and the preceding volume, we have presented data on changes in the characteristics and experiences of Title I students which resulted from changes in the intra-district allocation process.* We have also described changes in program costs and program delivery patterns which enabled districts to serve additional students without a dramatic reduction in service per student. These findings represent the measurable outcomes of the Demonstration Study.

In addition to these measurable outcomes, the experiences of the LEAs as they planned and implemented local Demonstration projects provide information on the effects of altering the allocation of Title I resources to schools and students. Their experiences in implementing allocation policy changes shed light on a number of key issues which have emerged throughout Title I history and which surrounded the passage of the 1974 amendments. These issues include:

- problems associated with changing from poverty to achievement criteria in the allocation of Title I resources;
- issues of service delivery, particularly some problems surrounding supplementing vs. supplanting regular educational programs; and,
- parent involvement and reaction, particularly to the allocation policy changes.

The first of these three issues is basic to the Demonstration Study and was part of the Congressional mandate which permitted NIE to establish "working models" of change in the Demonstration districts. These districts were granted waivers from current Title I regulations to explore alternatives to the current poverty-based procedures for allocating Title I funds.

---

*James J. Vanecko, et al., ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Analysis of Baseline Data, Volumes I and II, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., October, 1977).

In their attempts to make alternative criteria operational, the districts faced such problems as:

- assessing the stability and comparability of standardized achievement tests in determining school eligibility;
- establishing criteria for student eligibility and targeting; and
- dealing with potential discentives due to the fact that as student achievement is raised, fewer resources are received under an achievement-based model.

Demonstration LEA responses to these problems are discussed in Section 4.1.

The second of the three issues--supplement/supplant problems--emerged during our study as an especially complex one for LEAs. Our examination of LEA implementation experiences leads us to conclude that districts are often faced with extremely difficult operational problems as they attempt to comply with the supplement/supplant provisions of Title I. Their problems are exacerbated by the controversy and ambiguities surrounding the interpretation of these provisions at both the state and federal levels.* In Section 4.2, we focus on some of the problems associated with providing a "supplemental" Title I experience under varying allocation options. These problems include:

- varying interpretation of the regulations at the SEA level; and
- reliance on pull-out compensatory instruction to meet legal requirements, which often results in scheduling problems.

Our interest in the third issue--parent involvement in and reaction to the Demonstration--stems from several sources. First, proponents of the use of educational criteria

---

*NIE, Administration of Compensatory Education, September 19, 1977.

in determining school eligibility argue that Title I will attract more support among all its involved constituencies as an educational program than a poverty program. Second, parent involvement is legislatively required in Title I under any type of allocation criteria. Moreover, parent involvement was a major focus of the Demonstration planning process.

Section 4.3 addresses questions surrounding both parent involvement and reaction. Data from a number of relevant constituent groups surveyed during the baseline year and the first year of implementation provide evidence concerning changes in understanding of and support for compensatory education programs. Further, on-site interviews with key Parent Advisory Council (PAC) members contribute information regarding PAC perceptions of the Demonstration planning and implementation process. Finally, data from district administrators yield information on the strategies and attempts of the districts to increase both the quantity and quality of parent involvement under the Demonstration.

4.1 Testing Issues

There are several interrelated concerns in the general area of achievement testing, all of which were addressed by at least some of the districts involved in the Demonstration. These concerns center on the properties of achievement tests as criteria in the determination of school eligibility, as well as student eligibility and targeting. Particularly where achievement criteria are used in the determination of school eligibility, the related question of disincentives is of interest, since this problem is cited as inherent to such an allocation policy.* That is, if resources

*Reisner, Liz, "Analysis of H.R. 7571--Proposal to Allocate Funds Under Title I, ESEA, According to Educational Need" (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Assistant Secretary, February 13, 1978). UNPUBLISHED WORKING PAPER.

are allocated on the basis of low achievement, some argue that there may be little incentive for raising students' achievement scores, because success would mean fewer instructional resources to work with in the future. In this section we look at problems and successes encountered by the districts in the application of achievement tests to allocate resources and examine the issue of disincentives from the districts' perspective.

4.1.1 The Use of Achievement Criteria in the Determination of School Eligibility

One criticism of achievement criteria as a means of qualifying schools is that achievement is a less stable measure than poverty. That is, the schools selected on the basis of achievement criteria are more likely to vary from year to year (or from test to test) than schools selected on the basis of poverty criteria.* Indeed, if compensatory services are effective, changes in the schools selected would be expected to occur as the achievement test scores of students in Title I schools improved.

Instability in the school selection process raises both pedagogical and practical problems. An interruption of services to schools may deprive some needy children of continued participation and result in the loss of any gains they may have achieved. The major practical concern is the necessity of shifting equipment and other resources to differing schools, which, in the case of labs equipped with sophisticated audio-visual equipment, may be difficult and expensive. Space may also be a problem in schools which have no established rooms to accommodate learning laboratories.

Only two Demonstration districts actually chose to use achievement tests in order to qualify schools for

---

*Ibid.

Title I services--Charlotte and Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The other districts either ignored school eligibility completely in the allocation process or continued to use poverty or poverty plus achievement to qualify schools. It is in the two North Carolina districts, then, that the problems associated with the utilization of achievement criteria in the determination of school eligibility can be seen most clearly. Both of these districts encountered problems with the stability of achievement criteria and solved them in quite different ways.

Before discussing the Charlotte and Winston-Salem experiences, however, it is important to point out that both of these districts chose a rather unusual approach to the application of achievement criteria. Both districts elected to qualify schools in which a certain percentage of the students scored below a given cut-off score. In the case of Charlotte, schools were deemed eligible if 35% of the students scored below the 30th percentile, according to national norms. In Winston-Salem, schools were deemed eligible if 40% of the students scored below the 35th percentile. This approach, which differs markedly from the current poverty-based procedure, may have heightened the instability of the achievenment-based model.* In order to qualify, a school need only have had a small gap between its observed percentage of low achievers and the national norm. For example, a Charlotte school performing up to national standards might have been expected to have 30% of its students scoring below the 30th

---

*Under the poverty-based model of current regulations, each school with a percentage (and/or number) of low-income children at least as high as the average percentage for the district is considered eligible for Title I services. Using a comparable achievement-based model, one can simulate the proportion of schools qualifying/not qualifying for Title I over time. Under this achievement-based model, one finds that on the average 82% of the schools in our Demonstration districts do not change eligibility status over time.

percentile. If it had 35% scoring below this percentile, it was eligible for services; if it had 34% scoring below, it was not. Thus, a small fluctuation in the school percentage over time could have led to a change in eligibility status.

Winston-Salem administered the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) in all elementary schools in the spring of 1976 in place of the previously used Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT). The resulting scores, if used to rerank schools, would have caused a dramatic change in schools eligible for 1976-77. Twenty-one of 24 schools previously served would have become ineligible for service. The decision was made by Title I administrators not to act on these data but rather to revert to the previously collected (for 1975-76) MAT test scores to determine school eligibility.

Several factors were taken into account in reaching this decision. Most important was the fear that so drastic an alteration in schools served would sacrifice the stability of the entire Title I program, but other factors were also important. Winston-Salem utilizes extensively equipped learning labs within its Title I schools, which would have made it difficult and expensive to transfer the program to different schools. Also, program adminstrators were aware of the potential negative reaction among principals and teachers if they were deprived of service.

CTBS tests were administered again in the spring of 1977 with very similar results. This time only five of the 24 schools being served in 1976-77 would have been eligible for service in 1977-78. The decision was again made to continue service to those schools previously declared eligible.

It is interesting that for 1978-79, Winston-Salem has made the decision to revert to qualifying schools under an economic formula--based on free and reduced lunch data--

regardless of the outcome of pending Title I legislation. Although their major stated rationale is the fact that by doing so a greater number of schools qualify for service, that so few of the same schools qualified over time may have also been a contributing factor.

The Winston-Salem experience demonstrates not only the potential instability associated with using this particular achievement-based model over time, but also the problem of identifying the appropriate test and subtest by which to determine school eligibility. The choice of test can be an important variable in school selection, and careful and knowledgeable local decision-making is required in the test selection process. In the case of Winston-Salem, the CTBS was chosen because its norming population and its objectives more closely resembled those of the district than the MAT. As was discussed, however, this choice, if implemented, would have led to major program upheaval.

The other district which elected the achievement allocation option--Charlotte--used the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) to determine school eligibility for 1976-1977. Based on these results, nine of the 49 schools which had qualified under poverty criteria became ineligible and were not served in 1976-77. Seventeen new schools became eligible and were served. Note that Charlotte is a larger school district than Winston-Salem and that the alteration involved was proportionally less drastic. Note also, however, that Charlotte too was committed to the use of multimedia learning labs and specialists and that one of the major problems this district faced in implementation was an "upheaval" in resources and personnel. Another and related problem was that of finding space within newly eligible schools to establish learning labs.

Nevertheless, Charlotte in 1977-78 again ranked its schools based on SAT results. The ranking left 23 of

the 57 schools served in 1976-77 ineligible and added one new school. Schools were served on the basis of this new ranking.

Program staff in Charlotte attribute the changes in test scores and school rankings which took place between 1976-77 and 1977-78 partially to the effect of service provided in 1976-77. Their interpretation is substantiated by the fact that schools which qualified in both years were, by and large, those with the greatest percentage of low-achieving students in 1976-77. While equal growth may have occurred in these schools, it may not have been sufficient to affect eligibility as it appears to have in the more marginal schools.

Charlotte adminstrators were aware of negative reaction among principals and teachers in those schools which were to lose services and spent considerable time, especially in the planning year, quelling their misgivings. School personnel report that the major factor in the eventual acceptance of the situation was the expectation that things would return to normal at the end of the Demonstration. This suggests that were achievement criteria adopted on an ongoing basis, there might well be negative reaction from a variety of affected groups.

Like Winston-Salem, Charlotte has reverted to the use of poverty-based school selection criteria for 1978-79. Using free and reduced price lunch as a criterion, Charlotte can qualify 57 schools for the 1978-79 school year, as compared to the 18 that administrators claim would qualify under achievement.

The experiences of Winston-Salem and Charlotte address directly the concern of stability in achievement allocation. It is apparent that in both cases, the particular achievement-based allocation model selected resulted in substantial variation in the schools deemed

eligible over time.* Pedagogical and related practical concerns affected the "hold harmless" decision made by Winston-Salem and caused implementation problems in Charlotte. If Charlotte personnel are correct in their assumption, the instability of achievement rankings may have been due partly to the effectiveness of the program. That so few schools qualified under achievement for 1978-79 lends some support to this assumption. Finally, it is not clear whether principals and teachers would willingly accept the instability of services beyond the parameters of the Demonstration.

4.1.2 Disincentives

The issue of disincentives is a policy question very closely related to achievement allocation. In simplest terms, the question is asked, "If funds are awarded to school districts and to schools on the basis of low achievement, does this remove the incentive to produce achievement gains?" The question may be viewed in its most serious form as "cheating" or actively attempting to suppress achievement scores. More likely, it may involve the loss of morale or motivation. Disincentives may exist at various organizational levels--the classroom, the school, and/or the school district.

In view of their chosen allocation option, administrators in the two North Carolina districts were asked specifically to address this issue. Further, since administrators in the other Demonstration districts have expressed an interest in the use of achievement criteria in allocating resources and since it was an issue of general concern, they were asked for their opinions as well.

Administrators in the majority of the districts pointed out that despite any possible disincentives associated with allocation based on achievement, there were incentives to improve achievement which served to offset them. Winston-

*As noted previously, this instability is not necessarily characteristic of all achievement based allocation models.

Salem and Charlotte personnel felt that the importance placed on improving reading achievement in the State of North Carolina (reading achievement was an issue in the last gubernatorial election) was such that it outweighed any potential disincentive problems. Other districts also mentioned competing incentives. These were especially notable in Houston, where the State Department of Education is in the process of developing a stringent accountability policy that ties principal/teacher salary and job security to student achievement.

Alum Rock has recognized a potential disincentive problem and taken steps to counteract it. Their Achievement Growth Incentive Plan is related to the State Early Childhood Education program policy of rewarding successful programs with additional funds for program expansion. Under the Plan (operative both in 1976-77 and 1977-78), additional funds are awarded to those ten schools in which identified students achieve the greatest growth as measured by total reading scores on standardized achievement tests.

Another factor of interest was mentioned by Charlotte. The extensive reranking procedures required to determine school eligibility in this district brought about the development of a closely monitored achievement testing program at the LEA level. This program was seen by Charlotte personnel as a safeguard against "cheating" at the school level. This safeguard could perhaps be generalized to the state level if achievement criteria were adopted and resulted in a testing program administered at that level.

In sum, the question of disincentives was not, and probably could not be, answered fully within the context of the Demonstration Study. For one thing, not many districts adopted an allocation policy which would have brought the problem to the fore. Those that did (Charlotte and Winston-Salem) did not actually face the problem. In the case of

Winston-Salem, administrators chose to "hold harmless" the schools to be served through the implementation years. In the case of Charlotte, although there was a negative reaction to the loss of service among principals and teachers, perhaps signifying a lowering of morale, this was counteracted by the knowledge that the Demonstration would end. Generally, one might conclude from these limited data that both the opportunity and desire to minimize test scores under achieve ment-based allocation policies may be less widespread than is feared. On the other hand, loss of morale may be an issue which proponents of achievement-based allocation should take into account and attempt to offset.

4.1.3 The Use of Achievement Criteria in Selecting Students

Regardless of allocation policy, all the Demonstration districts were faced with the necessity of establishing achievement criteria for student selection and service. In some sense this is not a Demonstration-related issue, since school districts must make this decision under current regulations. It surfaced in the Demonstration, however, particularly in those districts which chose a direct allocation option. By declaring all schools eligible, these districts by-passed school eligibility in the allocation process but encountered increased student eligibility and targeting problems. The major question which they endeavored to resolve during the planning year was to find a more equitable (rational) means of identifying the students to be served within the limits of their means and resources.*

For several of the districts, there was a move toward standardization of the student selection process during the first implementation year. For most districts,

---

*See D. Catherine Baltzell and Nancy N. Brigham (Eds.), ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Site Descriptions for the Baseline Year, Volumes I and II, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., 1978).

student eligibility procedures continued to reflect current practice; that is, a given cut-off point on a standardized achievement test was used to determine student eligibility. It was at the targeting phase--the stage at which students were selected from among this pool of eligibles--that districts primarily made changes. Many districts had previously relied heavily on teacher judgment and vague criteria at this stage. Under waivers, more standardized procedures were adopted in order to serve those most in need first.

In Berkeley County, for example, students had previously received service on a "first come, first served" basis. A major change implemented under the Demonstration was the development of a formalized policy of student targeting. This policy established a priority for service based based on severity of need. Berkeley County also administered intelligence tests in order to identify children who were eligible for special education services. These children were not included in the Title I population as they had often been previously.

Mesa took an approach unique among the Demonstration districts in that it attempted to combine the eligibility and targeting phases of student selection. Under their locally developed Program Emphasis Achievement Model all elementary schools (with a minimum of 20 eligible students) qualified for service. According to this model design, student eligibility and targeting within schools were based on the following procedures:

- Program directors, with input from PAC members and principals, first determined the percentage of Title I resources to be spent by subject area (reading and mathematics) in each grade.
- The number of students which these resources could serve in each subject area in each grade was then determined.
- Criterion-referenced tests were administered in each subject at each grade level.

- Using the district-wide distribution of scores on these tests, a cut-off level was determined for each subject in each grade, which reflected the number of students to be served.

- Finally, students with scores below the cut-off level in each grade and subject were selected for service.

In principle, since the number of elementary students to be served actually determined the cut-off score for student eligibility, the targeting decision naturally followed from the eligibility decision. That is, all eligible elementary students were to be served. So too, the distribution of resources across schools was enmeshed in the student selection process. Although this policy was not fully implemented, it represented a new approach to student selection.

Another distinctly different approach was taken by Newport, which used the opportunity of the Demonstration to operationalize the concept of the "capacity-achievement gap." It had long been the conviction of Newport personnel that priority should be given to serving students who showed the greatest gap between their achievement and their capacity to learn. A complex selection formula was developed in order to determine both those who were eligible and those who were most in need of service. This formula assigned a priori weights to student achievement based on standardized tests, the capacity achievement gap, instructional reading level, and teacher judgment. In no case, however was a student eligible if he or she scored above the 50th percentile on standardized achievement tests.

In sum, in attempting to determine eligibility and targeting criteria at the student level, the Demonstration districts devised a variety of formulas, tinkered with various cut-off points, and moved closer to serving (in some cases) the lowest of their low-achieving population, or, in

the example of Newport, to serving those with the greatest discrepancy between achievement and academic potential. The method of student selection was seen as an important variable and many districts moved in the direction of greater standardization. The emphasis put on the student selection process was shown both by the amount of attention given to it in the planning year and by the variety of strategies that were developed.

4.2 Supplement-Supplant-Scheduling

While problems surrounding the supplement-supplant provisions were not a focal point of the Demonstration research, the study did provide an opportunity to explore districts' perceptions of and responses to selected programmatic requirements of the federal legislation for Title I. These LEA perceptions and responses are discussed in this section.

In an attempt to guarantee the supplementary nature of Title I as a compensatory program, the legislation and regulations governing Title I include certain provisions which restrict the utilization of federal funds. Among these provisions is the requirement that programs be designed "...to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families...[and to be] of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs...."* Besides this definition of the general target population and program goals, there are few requirements of a substantive nature which LEAs must meet. Most of these deal with the issue of supplanting, i.e.,

- Federal funds should be used "[so] as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal

*ESEA Title I enabling legislation, Section 141a.1.

sources...[and]...in no case, as to supplant such funds from non-Federal sources...."*

- State and local funds in an eligible LEA should be used "to provide services in project areas which, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services being provided in areas in such districts which are not receiving funds under this title."**
- "If services are provided in the regular classroom or in other settings in which other than those [children] properly selected to participate in the project are present, these services will be directed [only] to the selected children...."***

In general, the monitoring and regulation of LEAs with regard to these (and all other) federal requirements is left to the states. This element of discretion allows variability of interpretation across SEAs and a lack of clarity which may cause problems for LEAs seeking to achieve compliance with the letter and the spirit of the law and regulations. For example, the requirement that "programs be of sufficient size, scope, and quality" generally leads LEAs to fear deconcentrating services, i.e. diluting their size and scope.

This was obviously a problem for the Demonstration districts which chose to serve all schools under the direct allocation option. In fact, most LEAs, regardless of option chosen, voiced concern over this issue during the planning year. And, all but two sought and received federal level waivers of the concentration regulation for the Demonstration itself. (For one LEA--Houston--this waiver was of special importance, for their SEA in previous years had applied an unusually stringent interpretation, which had seriously hampered efficient service delivery.)

The provision that services "be offered to only those children who have been selected to participate" has led many LEAs to utilize pull-out programs in order to

---

*ESEA Title I enabling legislation, Section 141a.3.

**Ibid.

***ESEA Title I program regulations, Section 116a.22b8.

guarantee participation by only targeted students. In a pull-out program, Title I students are removed from their regular classroom in order to receive special instruction in another location. Although the educational value of pull-out programs is currently in question, all but two of the Demonstration districts were committed to this approach before the Demonstration and did not seriously consider other alternatives during the planning year. Pull out programs were maintained although district administrators reported a variety of problems with them. Among the commonly voiced concerns were such problems as finding space to accommodate students and scheduling pull-out instruction so as to avoid disruption of the regular instructional day.

A shortage of space was raised as a concern by several districts, most notably by Charlotte which, as described in Section 4.1, reranked schools yearly under the Demonstration. Charlotte's case is illustrative of problems which can result from large scale shifts in schools served. Pull-out programs are often housed in specially equipped resource rooms which contain sophisticated learning equipment. Charlotte's moving of the equipment from one school to another, which resulted in a significant "upheaval," was complicated by the necessity of finding space to set up learning labs in schools not previously served. Given such complications, one can speculate that the investment in pull-out instruction within Title I schools can lead to an informal but practical commitment to the delivery and continuation of services in those schools equipped for pull-out instruction.

Two possible alternatives to school-based pull-out instruction were found among the Demonstration districts. One of these involved use of out-of-school facilities to provide pull-out instruction. The other involved "saturating" services within Title I schools. The former option was adopted in Santa Fe, Berkeley County, and Boston. Santa Fe

maintained an Educational Service Center (ESC). The ESC, which was located apart from the regular school buildings, served as a materials resource center, a training center for teachers, and a classroom building for students with severe reading problems. In 1975-76, approximately 142 elementary students were transported to and from the center two to four times a week for instruction.

Another alternative was the mobile Reading/Math lab which was used by Berkeley County to serve two Title I schools. Boston's Alpha Bus similarly provided compensatory instruction in a mobile setting. Although currently serving relatively few schools and students, mobile labs appear to be one possible answer to the space/ equipment problems which can occur when schools lose and gain services frequently.

Alum Rock and Yonkers, on the other hand, attempted to resolve supplement/supplant issues by serving all children in Title I schools. Both used the waivers to designate a certain number of Title I schools as "saturated," with no distinction made between Title I and non-Title I recipients. In the case of Alum Rock, this was a case of the waivers following actual practice. Given the high proportion of students in the district labelled educationally disadvantaged--83% according to district estimates--and an in-class compensatory instruction strategy, the district has had a difficult time differentiating between compensatory and regular instruction for Title I/non-Title I students.

In the case of Yonkers, while the district chose to serve all students in some schools, it retained the pull-out model of instruction. Entire classes were pulled out of their regular classrooms for remedial services in specially equipped labs.

Even more commonly reported than space concerns were the scheduling problems associated with pull-out programs. Given that language arts/reading instruction makes up about one-third of the regular instructional day for both Title I and non-Title I students, there is difficulty in scheduling language arts pull-out instruction so that loss of regular instruction is avoided.*

Findings from the Classroom Activities Log (CAL) data suggest that the Demonstration districts were not entirely successful in surmounting this difficulty.** In many cases, compensatory instruction, which was primarily in the reading/language arts area, was provided in place of part of the regular academic instruction. Most frequently, compensatory instruction occurred during regularly scheduled language arts, which was the subject missed by Title I students 58% of the time, on the average. Compensatory instruction also occurred during instruction in other regularly scheduled basic skill areas, however. Fully 80% of the time, the subject missed by Title I students was language arts, mathematics, science, or social studies.

On the basis of these findings, it might be easy to accuse the districts of failing to live up to the spirit (as opposed to the letter) of the supplanting provisions. However, certain other factors that mitigate against such a conclusion must be taken into account. First, only 15% of the instructional day is devoted on average to non-academic instruction. Since the length of the instructional day for Title I students ranges from 232 minutes

---

*James Vanecko, Francis Archambault, Nancy Ames, et al., ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Results of First Year Implementation, Part I (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., March 30, 1978).

**Ibid., Chapter IV.

to 330 minutes in the Demonstration districts, only 35 to 49 minutes are available in which to take students from non-academic areas. Second, in 11 of the 12 districts for which data were available, Title I students received more total language arts instruction (regular and compensatory) than their non-Title I counterparts. Thus, in one sense, these districts did provide more of the basic language arts instruction to Title I students than to non-Title I students. Third, the nature or quality of the compensatory instruction differed from that of the regular instruction. Generally, compensatory instruction was provided in smaller groups, by instructional specialists, using more individualized techniques.*

In order to understand better the CAL data, which were based on classroom observations, stated guidelines for scheduling pull-out instruction were obtained from district administrators via on-site interviews. In general, the two data sources did not agree. Of course, district administrators are not likely to report that students are losing time in regular instruction even if they are aware of it. However, the difference in data sets may result not merely from administrators' caution in providing such information. The discrepancy may in part be a function of the different levels at which guidelines are generated and scheduling decisions are actually made. It may also be a function of the extent to which guidelines are monitored and enforced.

It is the responsibility of the SEAs to monitor local school districts with regard to supplanting. According to the reports of district administrators, however, there is great variability in the extent to which this takes place. Some districts report the existence of clear State guidelines, together with extensive monitoring. Other districts complain

---

*Ibid.

that they receive little guidance or interpretation of federal regulations from the SEA and little in the way of SEA regulation. One large metropolitan district reports that monitoring is uneven even within the State, i.e., that they are over-monitored while other smaller districts are overlooked.

While guidelines may be set and enforced at the SEA level, they must be carried out at the district level. Furthermore, the persons who must actually implement program requirements are at the school or even the classroom level. The Demonstration districts report that scheduling decisions are most often made by principals, classroom teachers and Title I instructional specialists. Under these conditions, some slippage is inevitable. Thus, while district administrators may report SEA and district policy, they may not be aware of school level practice.

The most commonly reported district policy on scheduling pull-out instruction is staggered scheduling, i.e., a child misses one classroom subject area one day and another on the following day. Thus, the child does not completely miss any single area of regular classroom instruction during the school year, as would be the case with non-staggered scheduling. This solution, however, often leads to a serious disruption of the instructional day, a complaint voiced by many teachers. Staggered scheduling also places a tremendous burden on the regular classroom teacher, since, especially with elementary children, the responsibility for keeping track of the schedule often falls on her or him.

The seriousness of the disruption problem increases with the number of pull-out programs placed in the school, as is illustrated by Winston-Salem. In 1976-77, Winston-Salem had one school with both reading and math

labs for Title I students. At the end of the school year, the principal requested that the math lab be removed for the following year because classroom teachers had complained about excessive disruption of instruction and too much traffic in and out of the classroom. Since schools are generally desirous of compensatory services, this incident speaks to active dissatisfaction with the staggered scheduling solution.

On the other hand, the alternative approach where a child consistently misses one area of classroom instruction (such as spelling or science) appears to be even less satisfactory. Many administrators reported that where this occurs the child completely misses or receives only minimal exposure to an area of instruction. Teachers are then unable to grade the child in this area, which frequently upsets parents.

Another problem related to scheduling (whether staggered or non-staggered) is also reported by districts. Children are often forced to miss enjoyable aspects of the curricular day, such as art or music, in order to receive additional instruction in the subject areas in which they have not been successful. This may lead them to view their Title I instruction as punitive.

Not all districts have adopted the staggered schedule approach. Mesa maintains an intensive reading/language arts program during the entire morning. It is the policy of the district to schedule Title I instruction during the individual study portion of the program. The argument which administrators make in favor of this decision is as follows. Seat work is generally used to reinforce skills and concepts being taught. Since children who need remedial instruction have often not mastered these skills or concepts, they may not benefit from individual seat work of may require an inordinate amount of teacher help to

accomplish it. Mesa personnel state that while their scheduling decision may be technically in violation of the regulatory interpretations promulgated by their SEA, they can see no practical alternative to it.

In summary, 11 of the 13 Demonstration districts were committed to the delivery of Title I services through pull-out programs both before and after the granting of waivers. In part this approach seems to be a response to the supplanting regulations, but according to the Classroom Activities Log data, it does not solve the problem of replacing some portion of regular academic instruction. In fact, this solution creates special difficulties for districts. Problems of scheduling and instructional disruption often occur at the school and classroom level where such programs are implemented. Furthermore, difficulties in monitoring result in some slippage between SEA and district policy and school level practice. These data serve to underscore two policy-related questions:

- Are pull-out programs the most efficient and practical method of achieving compensatory instruction?
- Are current supplement/supplant regulations sufficiently clear and realistic?

4.3 Political Impact of the Demonstration on Various Constituencies

One of the arguments advanced by proponents of achievement criteria for Title I is that as an educational program Title I will attract broader-based political support --especially local support--than it attracts as a poverty program. Several of the districts apparently saw this aspect of the Demonstration as important, since four of them included the desire to eliminate the "stigma" of Title I as a rationale for involvement in their original proposals.

Before looking for evidence of change in the level of political support, it is necessary to define the constituencies that might reasonably be expected to have some opinions concerning Title I. On the one hand, there are the "closer" constituencies of Title I principals, teachers, specialists, and parents, all of whom are involved to some degree in the program. On the other hand, there are the "more remote" constituencies, of non-Title I principals, teachers, and parents who, while not involved in Title I, are nonetheless involved in the local educational process. If increased popular support for and understanding of Title I results from the Demonstration, it is among these groups that we may look for some sign of it. In the first part of this section, we are concerned with change, if any, in these constituencies' opinions concerning the following issues:

- overall effectiveness of compensatory education programs;
- support for poverty- or achievement-based techniques of selecting students for compensatory programs;
- support for concentration or saturation of services across schools with varying numbers of eligible students; and
- overall appropriateness of standardized achievment tests for assessing student performance.

In the latter part of this section, we pay particular attention to one of the constituencies which is of great importance within the Title I program. The parents of Title I students are addressed as a group by legislative mandate, and it is required that local school districts give Title I parents meaningful participation in their childrens' education through school and district level Parent Advisory Councils (PACs). It is the intention of the law that PAC organizations not only be informed of Title I programs and services, but also take an active role in planning and

making policy decisions. Therefore, we examine the efforts made by districts to offer this kind of role to Title I parents and to involve parents in PAC organizations during the Demonstration.

4.3.1 Changes in Policy Preference

As in 1975-76, in 1976-77 Title I and non-Title I principals, teachers, compensatory specialists, and three groups of parents were asked to respond to items addressing the four policy issues specified above. In the second year of the Demonstration, as in the first, there were no dramatic differences among groups. There was also very little change in preference from 1975-76 to 1976-77 in general, as shown in Table 4.1. Summarizing briefly,

- Compensatory programs continued to be viewed positively.
- Achievement was still preferred to poverty as a student selection criterion.
- No group expressed a strong preference for either saturation or concentration.*
- Standardized achievement tests were viewed somewhat more favorably by principals and parents than by teachers and specialists.

Furthermore, despite the speculation that the Demonstration would increase awareness of involved constituencies, very few changes were found in any of the items which would indicate greater awareness. For instance, there was virtually no change in the percentage of respondents who saw no opposition between concentration and saturation school selection techniques. Based on these data, there is little evidence that the presence of the Demonstration in the

---

*Concentration refers to concentrating Title I services within schools which have the greatest need while saturation is providing services to all schools having some need.

TABLE 4.1

POLICY PREFERENCES FOR VARIOUS CONSTITUENT GROUPS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE DEMONSTRATION*

POLICY ISSUE	PRINCIPALS				TEACHERS				COMPENSATORY SPECIALISTS		PARENTS					
	TITLE I		NON-TITLE I		TITLE I		NON-TITLE I				TITLE I		NON-TITLE I/ TITLE I SCHOOLS		NON-TITLE I/ NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS	
	75-76	76-77	75-76	76-77	75-76	76-77	75-76	76-77	75-76	76-77	75-76	76-77	75-76	76-77	75-76	76-77
EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS**	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4
POVERTY VS. ACHIEVEMENT BASED STUDENT SELECTION***	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
CONCENTRATED VS. SATURATED SCHOOL SELECTION***	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS AS MEASURES OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE**	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7

*These summary results reflect the reactions of the various respondents across the 13 districts calculated by averaging individual site means for each group. Non-Title I means for Year 2 are based on fewer than 13 sites, since many sites had no non-Title I schools.

**4 = Very effective; 3 = Moderately effective; 2 = Slightly effective; 1 = Ineffective.

***Values >2.5 indicate support for poverty or concentrated selection. Values <2.5 indicate support for achievement or saturated selection.

districts heightened common knowledge of the issues which the Demonstration addressed.

This somewhat surprising result may be due to several factors. First, the issues involved are difficult to understand, especially for non-school personnel. Second, in certain instances media coverage was poor, due to a preceived lack of "news-worthiness." (Some district staff stated that they attempted to obtain media coverage and failed.) Finally, some districts purposely kept a low profile concerning the Demonstration on the assumption that the attention attracted would be unfavorable.*

4.3.2 Title I Parent Participation

Our special interest in Title I parent involvement has led us to obtain a great deal of qualitative data relating to this issue. Specifically, we conducted written and oral interviews with LEA personnel, requested reports from our District Research Coordinators (DRCs), and conducted informal interviews with Title I parents involved in PAC groups. The parents were selected for our interviews by district personnel and were probably more informed and involved than the average Title I parent. In all likelihood, they represent the core group of parents who have taken part in PAC organizations--usually in leadership roles. Conclusions which are drawn must remain extremely tentative because of the complexity of the question and the nature of the evidence. The data are useful, however, in assessing both the extent to which participation is taking place and the kinds of efforts being made by districts to ensure meaningful parental involvement. We have explored these issues in light of the intent of the regulations concerning quality of parent participation in Title I.

---

*This latter explanation is based on reports of Abt Associates' District Research Coordinators.

It is part of Title I law that each year's local Title I application include a description of how parents of the children to be served were involved and consulted in planning the program. In fact, SEA officials may not approve an application unless it includes the signature of the PAC district chairperson attesting 1) that this involvement has taken place and 2) that the PAC approves of the district's application. In the case of the Demonstration, this power was extended to serve as a veto on taking part in the Demonstration. While most district PACs agreed to participation, one of the original 16 participating districts had to withdraw when the PAC refused to approve the planned allocation changes. Thus, it is clear that PACs are intended to have meaningful decision-making authority. However, in practice, this is not always the case.

Our evidence indicates that the primary cause of this lesser PAC involvement is a practical one. Since no process for involvement is specified in the law, school districts and PAC members must mutually define the role of the PAC membership. Even where districts are strongly committed to parent/PAC involvement and seek actively to encourage it, there appear to be several factors that inhibit PACs from taking a stronger role. Among these are:

- Many of the issues involved are educationally technical: e.g., identifying schools by various methods, setting cut-off scores for student eligibility or selection.
- Frequent attendance at meetings is required in order for parents to be fully informed. The majority of Title I parents interviewed in site visits reported that they do not have the time for that intensive a commitment.
- Title I parents are in general from a socio-economic group which is not

accustomed to taking an active role politically. Thus, they may not understand the full limits of the influence they can exert.

Despite these impediments, we found much to suggest that the Demonstration districts have made strong efforts to involve PAC members actively and to increase parent participation overall. We were also told by parents who were involved that they had been given opportunities to understand and react to the Demonstration, and that they felt their opinions were important. However, in general they were willing to leave the planning and implementation of the program to the administrators.

Among the efforts made by the districts to increase involvement were:

- distributing newsletters and information pamphlets to the parents of Title I students;
- setting aside resource and meeting rooms for parent use;
- establishing visiting days for parents to observe the program in operation; and,
- utilizing liaison personnel to provide a link between the school to the home--especially Paid Parent Coordinators.

Of these approaches, one of the most effective (according to many district personnel), was the use of Paid Parent Coordinators. Four districts which used Parent Coordinators (two predating the Demonstration, and two employed since the Demonstration) reported that the coordinators were valuable in explaining Title I programs to parents, in coordinating and assisting local PAC organizations, and in serving as liaisons between teachers or specialists and the home. These coordinators were seen as linkage agents between school and home and frequently served to help parents feel more comfortable with the program and the school.

In conclustion, we have found indications that school districts attempted to provide information and opportunities for feedback to core PAC groups. It appears that they also made efforts to reach out to other parents through various strategies. One which was considered especially effective was employing a parent coordinator in a liaison role.

APPENDIX A

COMPARISON OF DATA SOURCES FOR TITLE I SERVICES

COMPARISON OF DATA SOURCES FOR TITLE I SERVICES

As noted in Chapter 2.0, the student services described in this report were based on data supplied by Title I administrators during site visits. These data were also used in the Demonstration cost study. Findings presented in previous reports were based on classroom observation data.* Observation data were obtained by having homeroom teachers complete a Classroom Activities Log (CAL) for two sample students on two sample days each at 10 minute intervals throughout the day. This Appendix compares the changes in student services found using each of these data sources.

Table A-1 presents four different measures of the proportional change in Title I services per student between 1976-76 and 1976-77. Column 1 is based upon data from the CAL and measures the change in compensatory language arts/reading instruction received by third and fourth grade Title I students as a proportion of the instructional day. Columns 2, 3, and 4 are based upon site visit/cost study data. Column 2 also measures the change in the amount of compensatory reading instruction received by Title I students as a proportion of the instructional day. Columns 3 and 4, on the other hand, measure the change in compensatory instruction received as a proportion of the instructional year. Therefore, both take into account changes in the days per week and weeks per year that such instruction was experienced. Column 3 refers to the change in Title I reading instruction only; column 4 refers to the change in all subject areas.

Since both columns 1 and 2 describe changes in the amount of compensatory language arts/reading instruction received as a proportion of the instructional day, differences between the two columns can be ascribed to the use of differing data sources. That is, differences between the two

---

*James J. Vanecko, Francis X. Archambault, Nancy Ames, et al., ESEA Title I Allocation Policy: Demonstration Study--Results of First Year Implementation, Part I (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., March, 1978).

TABLE A-1

A COMPARISON OF FOUR MEASURES OF THE PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN TITLE I SERVICES PER STUDENT FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	(1) CAL DATA MINUTES COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE ARTS PER DAY ÷ MINUTES INSTRUCTIONAL DAY	(2) COST DATA MINUTES COMPENSATORY READING PER DAY ÷ MINUTES INSTRUCTIONAL DAY	(3) COST DATA MINUTES COMPENSATORY READING PER YEAR ÷ MINUTES INSTRUCTIONAL YEAR	(4) COST DATA MINUTES TOTAL COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTION PER YEAR ÷ MINUTES INSTRUCTIONAL YEAR
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools				
Adams County #12	-6%	-14%	30%	40%
Harrison County	7	12	19	15
Mesa	-41	-8	-18	-16
Newport	NA	10	-7	-15
Racine	-25	-46	-46	-45
Santa Fe	-4	-20	-20	-22
Districts that rank schools by achievement & serve fewer than all elementaries				
Charlotte	-13	0	0	9
Winston-Salem	-1	-1	5	7
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty				
Berkeley County	-32	7	-1	-4
Boston	-20	-10	-20	-20
Houston	-10	-11	5	-1
Districts making primarily intra-school changes				
Alum Rock	-20	-35	-35	-35
Yonkers	9	NA	NA	NA
MEAN	-13%	-10%	-8%	-8%

reflect differences in the amount of instruction observed by teachers and reported by program administrators. On the average, the two data sources reveal roughly comparable changes across districts. In 9 of the 11 districts for which both data sources are available, the two measures produce results which are consistent in direction, if not in magnitude. Furthermore, neither measure appears to produce consistently greater or smaller changes than the other.

Columns 2 and 3 are both based on cost data, but differ in the length of time described. Column 2 presents changes in the amount of compensatory reading instruction received as a proportion of the instructional day, column 3 as a proportion of the instructional year. Thus, differences between these two columns can be ascribed to changes in the number of days per week and/or weeks per year that a typical Title I student received compensatory instruction. A comparison of the two data sets reveals seven districts in which the results are consistent in direction and five in which they are inconsistent. Differences in the magnitude of the changes do not consistently favor one or the other measure.

Finally, differences between columns 3 and 4 can be ascribed to differences in the changes observed for reading and for all subject areas. In 10 of the 12 districts for which both data sets are available, the findings are consistent for reading and all subject areas. Generally they are comparable in both direction and magnitude. In Charlotte and Houston, both of which have sizeable mathematics components, the data sets differ in direction. The magnitude of the differences, however, is not substantial.

Summarizing the data presented in Table A-1, the following pattern holds:

1. Averaging across districts, the four measures of service reveal a fairly consistent pattern. The typical Title I student appears to have lost between 8% and 13% of the time spent in compensatory instruction,

depending on the particular measure service utilized.

2. For eight of the districts, the results are relatively consistent across the four measures.

   -- For six, the direction if not the magnitude of the changes is invariant across measures. These are Harrison, Mesa, Racine, Santa Fe, Boston, and Alum Rock.

   -- For two, Winston-Salem and Houston, the direction changes but the magnitude of the differences between the CAL and cost measures is generally small (less than 10%).

3. For four of the districts, the results are not consistent across measures.

   -- For two, Adams County #12 and Newport, there are relatively large differences which appear to be attributable to program duration for the most part.

   -- For one, Berkeley County, the difference is largely attributable to the use of alternative data sources.

   -- For one, Charlotte, the difference is attributable to both the use of alternative data sources and differential change by subject area.

In conclusion, it appears that the CAL and cost measures are generally consistent in direction if not in magnitude of effects. Where there are differences between the two, they appear to be as much a function of changes in program duration or differential change by subject area as a function of multiple data sources. Neither measure appears to consistently over- or underestimate the size of the effects observed.

Throughout this report, we have chosen to use the cost data exclusively for several reasons. First, all of the expenditures data reflect costs of all Title instructional components, not just language arts (both for the total Title I program and for elementary Title I instruction). In addition, data describing program characteristics, resource

use, and expenditures were collected at the end of the academic year so that program information as well as expenditures are based on the full program year. Thus, the student FTE measure of service is consistent, in terms of both scope and collection methods, with the Title I expenditures data reported herein.

APPENDIX B

INCREASE IN TITLE I EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION ATTRIBUTED TO ALLOCATION CHANGE, CHANGE IN CARRY-OVER USAGE, AND REDISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES WITHIN TITLE I

APPENDIX B-1

INCREASE IN TITLE I EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION ATTRIBUTED TO ALLOCATION CHANGE, CHANGE IN CARRY-OVER USAGE, AND REDISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES WITHIN TITLE I[a]

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	(a) CHANGE IN ELEMENTARY EXPENDITURES	(b) DIFFERENCE ATTRIBUTABLE TO ALLOCATION CHANGE[b]	(c) DIFFERENCE ATTRIBUTABLE TO CHANGE IN CARRY-OVER USAGE[c]	(d) DIFFEERENCE ATTRIBUTABLE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES WITHIN TITLE I[d]
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools				
Adams County #12	$ 72,792	$-12,449	$ 22,216	$ 63,025
Harrison County	147,140	35,493	126,832	-15,185
Mesa	-2,976	NA[e]	NA	NA
Newport	145,242	8,263	131,604	5,375
Racine	374,159	-3,286	31,488	345,957
Santa Fe	37,645	67,494	-139,784	109,935
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries				
Charlotte	25,148	NA	NA	NA
Winston-Salem	420,906	90,722	228,275	101,909
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty				
Berkeley County	4,944	NA	NA	NA
Boston	654,400	71,889	765,682	-183,171
Houston	831,091	428,676	312,251	90,164
Districts making primarily intra-school changes				
Alum Rock	-14,133	NA	NA	NA
Yonkers	-430,970	NA	NA	NA

[a]Negative values in columns b through d indicate that either Title I allocations declined, carry-over was accumulated, or funds expended on non-elementary or non-instructional elementary activities in 1976-77 exceeded funds expended for these activities in 1975-76, respectively.

[b]Difference attributable to allocation change = 1976-77 allocation - 1975-76 allocation.

[c]Difference attributable to carry-over depletion = (1976-77 total Title I expenditures - 1975-76 total Title I expenditures) - column b.

[d]Difference attributable to redistribution = column a - (columns b+c).

[e]NA indicates not applicable because Title I expenditures for elementary instruction showed virtually no change.

APPENDIX C

TABLES SUPPORTING CHAPTER 3, PROGRAM DELIVERY

TABLE C-1

PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OFFERING VARIOUS COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTION ACTIVITY											
			BASIC SKILLS				SPECIAL SERVICES		MISCELLANEOUS					
POLICY OPTION / LEA	75-76	76-77	READING	LANGUAGE ARTS	MATHEMATICS	PRE-SCHOOL KINDERGARTEN LEARNING ACTIVITIES	BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION	ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE	LOWER STUDENT: ADULT RATIO	MUSIC, ART	GENERAL ENRICHMENT	SCIENCE OR SOCIAL/ CULTURAL STUDIES	INDUSTRIAL ARTS/HOME ECONOMICS	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools			% change	% change	% change	% change	% change	% change	% change	% change	% change	% change	% change	% change
Adams County #12	12	16	499	14	-100	NP[a]	201	NMF[b]	NMF	NP	NP	NMF	NP	NP
Harrison County	29	30	21	-37	45	106	NMF	NP	57	NMF	NMF	106	NP	NP
Mesa	19	20	73	-29	90	43	16	33	-5	-52	-100	NMF	NP	NP
Newport	10	10	0	-78	NMF	-50	0	0	-100	NP	NMF	NP	NP	NP
Racine	24	27	4	2	-100	NA[c]	3	-12	-76	NP	-100	-5	NP	NMF
Santa Fe	16	16	33	-13	100	503	0	0	-100	-100	-24	52	NP	NP
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries														
Charlotte	67	70	4	-8	23	NMF	NMF	NMF	-100	NP	-100	NMF	NP	NP
Winston-Salem	37	37	72	48	NMF	-100	NP	NP	0	-100	-100	NP	NP	NP
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty														
Berkeley County	11	14	-13	-23	-12	-23	NP	NP	-23	NP	-23	NMF	NP	NP
Boston	74	83	44	11	211	43	614	31	329	95	329	196	-63	NMF
Houston	119	110	-30	-58	-29	-31	27	-8	9	32	-60	-40	NMF	60
Districts making primarily intra-school changes														
Alum Rock	12	17	-6	-4	-4	6	6	-5	-23	40	-6	-9	-28	NP
Yonkers	25	24	-14	25	58	-46	-29	-8	NMF	NP	325	NP	NP	NP

[a] NP indicates that the program/service in question did not operate in the district for either year. This is indicated by a zero in the following within-year table.

[b] NMF indicates that no meaningful figure could be calculated, i.e., a percentage change could not be calculated when a particular program did not operate in 1975-76 but did operate in 1976-77.

[c] NA indicates that data were not available. In 1975-76 Racine did have both a pre-school and kindergarten program; in 1976-77, however, Racine dropped the pre-school program but not the kindergarten program. Since the questionnaire combined pre-school and kindergarten, the 1976-77 data were not useful.

TABLE C-2

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OFFERING VARIOUS COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT IN 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION / POLICY OPTION / LEA	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTION ACTIVITY																			
		BASIC SKILLS										SPECIAL SERVICES				MISCELLANEOUS					
		READING		LANGUAGE ARTS		MATHEMATICS		PRE-SCHOOL KINDERGARTEN LEARNING ACTIVITIES		BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION		ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE		LOWER STUDENT: ADULT RATIO		MUSIC, ART		GENERAL ENRICHMENT		SCIENCE OR SOCIAL/ CULTURAL STUDIES		INDUSTRIAL ARTS/HOME ECONOMICS		OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools																									
Adams County #12	16	16	100	3	19	0	0	0	0	4	25	2	13	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0
Harrison County	30	30	100	4	13	3	10	2	7	1	3	0	0	1	3	1	3	3	10	2	7	0	0	1	3
Mesa	20	20	100	3	15	20	100	3	15	11	55	14	70	2	10	1	5	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0
Newport	10	10	100	2	20	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racine	27	27	100	24	89	0	0	NA*	NA	8	30	4	15	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	4
Santa Fe	16	16	100	6	38	4	25	6	38	7	44	2	13	0	0	0	0	3	19	3	19	0	0	0	0
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries																									
Charlotte	70	49	70	8	11	41	59	1	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Winston-Salem	37	24	65	6	16	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty																									
Berkeley County	14	10	71	2	14	9	64	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	1	7	1	7	0	0	0	0
Boston	83	58	70	5	6	35	42	22	27	8	10	13	16	5	6	7	8	5	6	7	8	2	2	3	4
Houston	110	40	36	16	15	30	27	28	25	12	11	8	7	12	11	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4
Districts making primarily intra-school changes																									
Alum Rock	17	16	94	14	88	15	88	12	71	12	71	12	71	12	71	6	35	8	47	13	76	1	6	0	0
Yonkers	24	9	38	6	25	9	38	3	13	4	17	8	33	1	4	0	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0

*NA indicates that data were not available at the time this table was completed. In 1975-76 Racine did have both a pre-school and kindergarten program; in 1976-77, however, Racine dropped the pre-school program but not the kindergarten program. Since the questionnaire combined pre-school and kindergarten, the 1976-77 data were not useful.

TABLE C-3

PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS PROVIDING VARIOUS COMPENSATORY SUPPORT SERVICES BY DISTRICT

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		SUPPORT SERVICE											
			COUNSELING	PSYCHOLOGICAL DIAGNOSTIC OR PSYCHIATRIC	SOCIAL WORK	COMMUNITY SERVICES	SPEECH AND HEARING THERAPY	MEDICAL/ DENTAL	TRANSPORTATION	FOOD SERVICES	CLOTHING	LIBRARY	STAFF RESOURCE CENTER	OTHER
POLICY OPTION / LEA	75-76	76-77	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools														
Adams County #12	12	16	14	57	57	-22	NMF[a]	50	-28	100	NMF	24	57	NMF
Harrison County	29	30	282	259	52	88	45	28	-3	126	10	190	34	NMF
Mesa	19	20	-24	-53	43	-52	66	-5	122	27	NMF	43	-6	NP[b]
Newport	10	10	100	0	0	-100	0	100	0	0	NP	800	NP	NP
Racine	24	27	-49	-47	-54	-35	-10	NP	56	34	NP	-32	20	NMF
Santa Fe	16	16	0	101	20	297	12	12	14	49	-50	-17	60	NMF
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries														
Charlotte	67	70	-60	-67	-83	9	-100	-95	NMF	30	NMF	73	-42	-33
Winston-Salem	37	37	17	50	80	-80	NMF	-40	-100	-47	-100	-83	-50	NP
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty														
Berkeley County	11	14	-62	-100	-21	-23	-62	15	54	6	-23	-23	NP	NP
Boston	74	83	290	76	-7	-19	11	89	48	46	43	87	543	NMF
Houston	119	110	-48	-74	-20	2	-76	27	-76	-65	15	-63	-49	150
Districts making primarily intra-school changes														
Alum Rock	12	12	-24	-64	-28	-15	-13	-46	-3	23	NP	-9	-19	NP
Yonkers	25	17	92	50	31	NMF	6	NMF	225	32	NMF	25	63	NMF

[a] NMF indicates that no meaningful figure could be calculated, i.e., a percentage change could not be calculated when a particular program did not operate in 1975-76 but did operate in 1976-77.

[b] NP indicates that the program/service in question did not operate in the district for either year. This is indicated by a zero in the following within-year table.

TABLE C-4

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS PROVIDING VARIOUS COMPENSATORY SUPPORT SERVICES BY DISTRICT IN 1976-77

DATE SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	SUPPORT SERVICE																	
		COUNSELING		PSYCHOLOGICAL DIAGNOSTIC OR PSYCHIATRIC		SOCIAL WORK		COMMUNITY SERVICES		SPEECH AND HEARING THERAPY		MEDICAL/ DENTAL		TRANSPORTATION		FOOD SERVICES		CLOTHING		LIBRARY		STAFF RESOURCE CENTER		OTHER	
POLICY OPTION / LEA	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools																									
Adams County #12	16	3	19	2	13	2	13	2	13	1	6	4	25	1	6	8	50	1	6	5	31	2	13	1	6
Harrison County	30	4	13	11	37	14	47	4	13	6	20	29	97	6	20	21	70	23	77	12	40	11	37	3	10
Mesa	20	4	20	2	10	3	15	1	5	7	35	5	25	7	35	16	80	1	5	12	60	1	5	0	0
Newport	10	2	20	1	10	1	10	0	0	1	10	2	20	1	10	10	100	0	0	9	90	0	0	0	0
Racine	27	5	19	3	11	5	19	5	19	4	15	0	0	7	26	21	78	0	0	10	37	4	15	2	7
Santa Fe	16	8	50	10	63	12	75	4	25	10	63	10	63	8	50	9	56	3	19	5	31	8	50	2	13
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries																									
Charlotte	70	2	3	1	1	3	4	9	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	23	33	0	0	9	13	4	6	1	1
Winston-Salem	37	7	19	3	8	9	24	1	3	0	0	3	8	0	0	8	22	0	0	1	3	1	3	0	0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty																									
Berkeley County	14	1	7	0	0	5	36	1	7	2	14	3	21	2	14	4	29	1	7	3	21	0	0	0	0
Boston	83	13	16	10	12	4	5	10	12	5	6	19	23	15	18	51	61	2	2	36	43	15	18	2	2
Houston	110	14	13	4	4	2	2	7	6	5	5	19	17	2	2	19	17	33	30	5	5	7	6	2	2
Districts making primarily intra-school changes																									
Alum Rock	17	3	18	2	12	1	6	7	41	5	29	3	18	11	65	14	82	0	0	13	76	8	47	0	0
Yonkers	24	11	46	10	42	10	42	4	17	4	17	2	8	3	13	14	58	3	13	6	25	3	13	3	13

TABLE C-5

PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OFFERING VARIOUS COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT BY SCHOOL TYPE

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY																			
			READING		LANGUAGE ARTS		MATH		PRE-SCHOOL KINDERGARTEN LEARNING ACTIVITIES		BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION		ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE		LOWER STUDENT: ADULT RATIO		MUSIC, ART		GENERAL ENRICHMENT		SCIENCE OR SOCIAL/ CULTURAL STUDIES		INDUSTRIAL ARTS/HOME ECONOMICS		OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL	
POLICY OPTION / LEA	TI 75-76 76-77	NTI 75-76 76-77	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools																										
Adams County #12	3, 16	9, 0	50	NS[a]	-72	NS	-100	NS	NP[b]	NS	-25	NS	NMF[c]	NS	NMF	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS	NMF	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS
Harrison County	24, 30	5, 0	0	NS	-48	NS	20	NS	29	NS	NMF	NS	NP	NS	-64	NS	NMF	NS	138	NS	67	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS
Mesa	9, 20	10, 0	0	NS	-55	NS	0	NS	-32	NS	-18	NS	26	NS	-10	NS	-77	NS	-100	NS	NMF	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS
Newport	4, 10	6, 0	0	NS	-80	NS	NMF	NS	-60	NS	-60	NS	-100	NS	-100	NS	NP	NS	NMF	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS
Marina	7, 27	17, 0	0	NS	4	NS	NP	NS	-100	NS	-58	NS	5	NP	-86	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS	NMF	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS
Santa Fe	11, 16	5, 0	0	NS	-30	NS	175	NS	318	NS	20	NS	43	NS	-100	NS	-100	NS	-30	NS	4	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries																										
Charlotte	44, 52	23, 18	-4	-100	-18	NP	9	NP	NMF	NP	NMF	NMF	NMF	NP	-100	NP	NP	NP	NP	-100	NMF	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Winston-Salem	13, 24	24, 13	0	-100	-19	NP	NMF	NP	-100	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	-44	NP	-100	NP	-100	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty																										
Berkeley County	8, 10	3, 4	33	-100	-20	NP	-10	NP	-20	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	-20	NP	NP	NP	-20	NP	NMF	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Boston	36, 60	38, 23	0	2246	-28	NMF	132	554	-5	NP	57	NMF	-12	NP	106	NP	329	400	186	NMF	329	NMF	-73	NP	NMF	NP
Houston	32, 44	87, 66	-6	-77	-39	-81	14	-80	-15	-100	-13	-78	186	-75	-14	-100	43	-66	-64	-100	126	-66	NMF	NP	43	-100
Districts making primarily intra-school changes																										
Alum Rock	6, 17	6, 0	-12	NS	6	NS	-12	NS	-15	NS	42	NS	-15	NS	-15	NS	110	NS	-30	NS	-8	NS	NMF	NS	NP	NS
Yonkers	7, 9	18, 15	0	229	-42	257	17	NMF	-23	-22	-38	132	25	-10	NMF	NMF	NP	NMF	NMF	132	NP	NMF	NP	NMF	NP	NMF

[a] NS indicates that the district had no non-Title I schools in 1976-77.

[b] NP indicates that the program/service in question did not operate in the district for either year. This is indicated by a zero in the following within-year table.

[c] NMF indicates that no meaningful figure could be calculated, i.e., a percentage change could not be calculated when a particular program did not operate in 1976-77.

TABLE C-6

PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OFFERING VARIOUS COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT BY SCHOOL TYPE IN 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY																					
			READING		LANGUAGE ARTS		MATH		PRE-SCHOOL KINDERGARTEN LEARNING ACTIVITIES		BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION		ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE		LOWER STUDENT: ADULT RATIO		MUSIC, ART		GENERAL ENRICHMENT		SCIENCE OR SOCIAL/ CULTURAL STUDIES		INDUSTRIAL ARTS/HOME ECONOMICS		OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL	
POLICY OPTION LEA	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools																										
Adams County #12	16	0	100	NS*	19	NS	0	NS	0	NS	25	NS	13	NS	13	NS	0	NS	0	NS	13	NS	0	NS	0	NS
Harrison County	30	0	100	NS	13	NS	10	NS	3	NS	3	NS	0	NS	3	NS	3	NS	10	NS	7	NS	0	NS	0	NS
Mesa	20	0	100	NS	15	NS	100	NS	15	NS	55	NS	70	NS	10	NS	5	NS	0	NS	10	NS	0	NS	0	NS
Newport	10	0	100	NS	20	NS	10	NS	10	NS	10	NS	0	NS	0	NS	0	NS	10	NS	0	NS	0	NS	0	NS
Racine	27	0	100	NS	89	NS	0	NS	0	NS	30	NS	15	NS	4	NS	0	NS	0	NS	4	NS	0	NS	4	NS
Santa Fe	16	0	100	NS	38	NS	25	NS	38	NS	44	NS	13	NS	0	NS	0	NS	19	NS	19	NS	0	NS	0	NS
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries																										
Charlotte	52	18	94	0	15	0	79	0	2	0	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Winston-Salem	24	13	100	0	25	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty																										
Berkeley County	10	4	100	0	20	0	90	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
Boston	60	23	97	61	8	4	58	17	37	0	13	4	22	0	8	0	12	13	8	4	12	13	3	0	5	0
Houston	44	66	91	8	36	5	68	6	64	0	27	3	18	2	27	0	9	2	9	0	7	2	7	0	9	0
Districts making primarily intra-school changes																										
Alum Rock	17	0	88	NS	88	NS	88	NS	71	NS	71	NS	71	NS	71	NS	35	NS	35	NS	77	NS	6	NS	0	NS
Yonkers	9	15	100	73	33	20	100	20	33	13	44	13	89	20	11	13	0	7	44	13	0	13	0	13	0	20

*NS indicates that the district had no non-Title I school in 1976-77.

TABLE C-7

PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS PROVIDING VARIOUS COMPENSATORY SUPPORT SERVICES BY DISTRICT BY SCHOOL TYPE

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		SUPPORT SERVICE																	
			COUNSELING		PSYCHOLOGICAL DIAGNOSTIC OR PSYCHIATRIC		SOCIAL WORK		COMMUNITY SERVICES		SPEECH AND HEARING THERAPY		MEDICAL/ DENTAL		TRANSPORTATION		FOOD SERVICES		CLOTHING		LIBRARY		STAFF RESOURCE CENTER		OTHER	
POLICY OPTION / LEA	TI 75-76 76-77	NTI 75-76 76-77	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools																										
Adams County #12	1, 1	9, 0	-72	NS[a]	-64	NS	-64	NS	-82	NS	-91	NS	-63	NS	-82	NS	-25	NS	NMF[b]	NS	-54	NS	-64	NS	NMF	NS
Harrison County	24, 3	5, 0	210	NS	196	NS	25	NS	57	NS	20	NS	6	NS	-20	NS	110	NS	-8	NS	140	NS	78	NS	NMF	NS
Mesa	9, 2	10, 0	-64	NS	-70	NS	-32	NS	-55	NS	5	NS	-44	NS	5	NS	-20	NS	NMF	NS	8	NS	NMF	NS	NP[c]	NS
Newport	4, 1	6, 0	NMF	NS	-60	NS	-60	NS	-100	NS	-60	NS	-20	NS	-60	NS	0	NS	NP	NS	260	NS	NP	NS	NP	NS
Racine	7, 2	17, 0	-30	NS	-23	NS	-37	NS	-30	NS	NMF	NS	NP	NS	5	NS	37	NS	NMF	NS	-57	NS	NMF	NS	NMF	NS
Santa Fe	11, 1	5, 0	-31	NS	36	NS	-17	NS	175	NS	-24	NS	-24	NS	-21	NS	23	NS	-65	NS	-15	NS	10	NS	NMF	NS
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries																										
Charlotte	44, 5	23, 18	-56	-100	-13	-100	-82	-100	-6	40	-100	-100	-93	-100	NMF	NP	13	-15	-100	NP	32	40	-41	-100	-13	NP
Winston-Salem	13, 2	24, 13	-37	NP	-22	NP	-14	NMF	-87	-100	NP	NP	-61	-100	-100	NP	-46	-76	-100	NP	-74	-100	-48	-100	NP	NP
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty																										
Berkeley County	8, 1	3, 4	-60	NP	-100	NP	-36	NP	-100	NP	-60	NP	-20	NP	-60	NP	-20	NP	-100	NP	-20	NP	NP		NP	NP
Boston	36, 6	38, 23	117	NMF	-6	NMF	-40	54	-44	NP	-37	NMF	12	NMF	4	54	18	90	7	NP	33	186	221	NMF	NMF	NP
Houston	32, 4	87, 66	-59	-71	-42	-100	29	-100	-15	-100	-65	-100	-2	-100	-57	-100	-51	-100	-22	82	-42	-84	-15	-100	NMF	-100
Districts making primarily intra-school changes																										
Alum Rock	6, 1	6, 0	-46	NS	-64	NS	-64	NS	-18	NS	74	NS	-46	NS	30	NS	-2	NS	NP	NS	-24	NS	-6	NS	NP	NS
Yonkers	7, 7	18, 15	17	NMF	17	25	17	-37	NMF	NMF	23	17	NP	NMF	NMF	132	37	41	NMF	NMF	131	-10	-23	160	NMF	NMF

[a] NS indicates that the district had no non-Title I schools in 1976-77.

[b] NMF indicates that no meaningful figure could be calculated, i.e., a percentage change could not be calculated when a particular program did not operate in 1975-76 but did operate in 1976-77.

[c] NP indicates that the program/service in question did not operate in the district for either year. This is indicated by a zero in the following within-year table.

TABLE C-8

PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS PROVIDING VARIOUS COMPENSATORY SUPPORT SERVICES BY DISTRICT BY SCHOOL TYPE IN 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		SUPPORT SERVICE																	
			COUNSELLING		PSYCHOLOGICAL DIAGNOSTIC OR PSYCHIATRIC		SOCIAL WORK		COMMUNITY SERVICES		SPEECH AND HEARING THERAPY		MEDICAL/ DENTAL		TRANSPORTATION		FOOD SERVICES		CLOTHING		LIBRARY		STAFF RESOURCE CENTER		OTHER	
POLICY OPTION LEA	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI	TI	NTI
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools																										
Adams County #12	16	0	19	NS[a]	12	NS	12	NS	12	NS	6	NS	25	NS	6	NS	50	NS	6	NS	31	NS	12	NS	6	NS
Harrison County	30	0	13	NS	37	NS	47	NS	13	NS	20	NS	97	NS	20	NS	70	NS	77	NS	40	NS	37	NS	10	NS
Mesa	20	0	20	NS	10	NS	15	NS	5	NS	35	NS	25	NS	35	NS	80	NS	5	NS	60	NS	5	NS	0	NS
Newport	10	0	20	NS	10	NS	10	NS	0	NS	10	NS	20	NS	10	NS	100	NS	0	NS	90	NS	0	NS	0	NS
Racine	27	0	18	NS	11	NS	18	NS	18	NS	15	NS	0	NS	15	NS	78	NS	0	NS	37	NS	15	NS	7	NS
Santa Fe	16	0	50	NS	62	NS	75	NS	25	NS	62	NS	62	NS	50	NS	56	NS	19	NS	31	NS	50	NS	12	NS
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries																										
Charlotte	52	18	4	0	2	0	6	0	15	6	0	0	2	0	19	0	36	11	0	0	15	6	8	0	2	0
Winston-Salem	24	13	29	0	12	0	33	8	4	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	29	8	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty																										
Berkeley County	10	4	10	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	20	0	20	0	10	0	30	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0
Boston	60	21	18	9	13	9	5	4	17	0	7	4	28	9	23	4	72	15	3	0	48	10	18	17	3	0
Houston	44	66	27	3	9	0	4	0	16	0	11	0	43	0	4	0	43	0	73	2	9	2	16	0	4	0
Districts making primarily intra-school changes																										
Alum Rock	17	0	18	NS	12	NS	6	NS	41	NS	29	NS	18	NS	65	NS	82	NS	0	NS	76	NS	47	NS	0	NS
Yonkers	9	15	100	13	100	7	100	7	22	13	22	13	0	13	11	13	78	47	11	13	33	20	11	13	11	13

[a] NS indicates that the district had no non-Title I schools in 1976-77.

TABLE C-9

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY PERSONNEL TYPE
OF TOTAL TITLE I PROGRAM IN 1975-76 AND 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: SITE DESCRIPTIONS
SAMPLE: SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL		ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL		AUXILIARY PERSONNEL	
POLICY OPTION LEA	1975-76	1976-77	1975-76	1976-77	1975-76	1976-77
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools						
Adams County #12	91%	86%	9%	11%	0%	3%
Harrison County	93	92	5	5	2	3
Mesa	93	94	7	5	0	1
Newport	77	91	18	6	5	3
Racine	82	91	11	7	7	2
Santa Fe	80	87	5	4	15	9
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries						
Charlotte	96	97	1	2	3	1
Winston-Salem	79	96	3	1	18	3
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty						
Berkeley County	95	97	2	1	3	2
Boston	85	87	6	5	9	8
Houston	89	82	5	10	6	8
Districts making primarily intra-school changes						
Alum Rock	87	84	4	9	9	7
Yonkers	NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MEAN	87.3%	90.3%	6.3%	5.5%	6.4%	4.2%

*Yonkers data were not available at the time this report was written.

TABLE C-10

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS INDICATING THAT VARIOUS TYPES OF PERSONS PROVIDING TITLE I LANGUAGE ARTS BY DISTRICT

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	LANGUAGE ARTS												
	GRADES 1-3							GRADES 4-6					
POLICY OPTION / LEA	N 75-76	N 76-77	CLASSROOM TEACHERS	SPECIALISTS	PAID AIDES	ADULT VOLUNTEERS	OLDER STUDENTS	N 75-76	N 76-77	CLASSROOM TEACHERS	SPECIALISTS	PAID AIDES	ADULT VOLUNTEERS	OLDER STUDENTS
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools														
Adams County #12	NA*	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Harrison County	21	30	-7.6	-3.8	-10.0	1.9	-12.3	21	30	-7.6	-3.8	-25.3	1.9	-7.6
Mesa	10	20	-35.0	-40.0	10.0	-15.0	-30.0	9	20	-39.4	-32.8	-3.9	2.8	-28.3
Newport	NP**	9	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	4	10	-65.0	-20.0	45.0	-20.0	-25.0
Racine	8	22	0.0	18.2	-4.5	-8.0	1.1	8	22	0.0	5.7	-4.5	4.5	4.5
Santa Fe	9	16	-49.3	-38.9	11.0	-2.0	5.6	9	15	-42.3	-42.2	4.4	-6.6	-11.1
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries														
Charlotte	33	37	-12.5	-1.4	-16.2	-10.4	-9.4	34	44	-7.3	-1.8	-15.3	-9.2	-4.3
Winston-Salem	10	16	6.3	-12.5	-6.2	12.5	6.3	12	22	-9.1	-5.3	-13.6	9.1	0.0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty														
Berkeley County	8	11	-10.2	-20.5	0.0	-10.2	-15.9	8	11	-10.2	-20.5	10.2	-15.9	-12.5
Boston	27	58	-12.1	-9.6	3.5	0.0	-2.0	24	57	-15.2	-6.8	8.1	0.0	-2.4
Houston	29	33	-2.0	-7.9	-10.1	-0.8	2.2	30	33	-1.5	-4.9	-4.2	-3.7	-0.6
Districts making primarily intra-school changes														
Alum Rock	6	16	-12.5	29.2	0.0	-8.3	-25.0	6	16	-12.5	29.0	-6.2	6.3	-33.3
Yonkers	5	9	-26.7	0.0	6.7	15.6	44.0	5	9	-26.7	0.0	15.6	15.6	11.1
RANGE			-49.3 - 6.3	-40.0 - 29.2	-16.2 - 11.0	-15.0 - 15.6	-30.0 - 44.0			-65.0 - 0.0	-42.2 - 29.0	-25.3 - 45.0	-20.0 - 15.6	-33.3 - 11.1
MEDIAN			-12.1	-7.9	0.0	-2.0	1.1			-11.4	-5.1	-4.1	1.0	-5.0

*NA indicates that data were not available or that the response to an item was insufficient (≤ 2) to permit interpretation and discussion. Where data were not available or sufficient in 1975-76, change is not analyzed.

**NP indicates that the program in question did not operate in the district. Where there was no program operating in 1975-76, change is not analyzed.

TABLE C-11

PERCENT OF SCHOOLS INDICATING THAT VARIOUS TYPES OF PERSONS PROVIDE TITLE I LANGUAGE ARTS BY DISTRICT IN 1976-77

DATA SOURCE:* PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION / POLICY OPTION — LEA	LANGUAGE ARTS											
	GRADES 1-3						GRADES 4-6					
	N	CLASSROOM TEACHERS	SPECIALISTS	PAID AIDES	ADULT VOLUNTEERS	OLDER STUDENTS	N	CLASSROOM TEACHERS	SPECIALISTS	PAID AIDES	ADULT VOLUNTEERS	OLDER STUDENTS
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools												
Adams County #12	16	0.0	100.0	56.3	25.0	6.3	13	0.0	7.7	7.7	0.0	0.0
Harrison County	30	6.7	86.7	90.0	6.7	6.7	30	6.7	86.7	3.3	6.7	6.7
Mesa	20	5.0	50.0	100.0	35.0	10.0	20	5.0	45.0	85.0	25.0	5.0
Newport	9	11.0	77.8	77.8	33.3	11.1	10	10.0	80.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
Racine	22	0.0	68.2	95.5	4.5	13.6	22	0.0	68.2	95.5	4.5	4.5
Santa Fe	16	6.3	50.0	100.0	31.3	50.0	15	13.3	46.7	93.3	26.7	33.3
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries												
Charlotte	37	2.7	86.5	38.3	10.8	2.7	44	4.5	86.4	81.8	11.4	4.5
Winston-Salem	16	6.3	87.5	9318	12.5	6.3	22	9.1	86.4	86.4	9.1	0.0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty												
Berkeley County	11	27.3	54.5	100.0	27.3	9.1	11	27.3	54.5	72.7	9.1	0.0
Boston	58	13.8	79.3	77.6	0.0	1.7	57	14.0	80.7	78.9	0.0	1.8
Houston	33	15.2	81.8	72.7	6.1	9.1	33	15.2	81.8	75.8	3.0	6.1
Districts making primarily intra-school changes												
Alum Rock	16	87.5	62.5	100.0	75.0	75.0	16	87.5	62.5	93.8	56.3	50.0
Yonkers	9	33.3	100.0	66.7	55.6	44.4	9	33.3	100.0	55.6	55.6	11.1
RANGE		0.0 — 87.5	50.0 — 100.0	56.3 — 100.0	0.0 — 75.0	1.7 — 75.0		0.0 — 87.5	7.7 — 100.0	3.3 — 95.5	0.0 — 56.3	0.0 — 50.0
MEDIAN		6.7	79.3	90.0	25.0	9.1		10.0	80.0	78.9	9.1	4.5

TABLE C-12

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS OFFERING COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROVIDING COMPENSATORY STAFF TRAINING SESSIONS, AND TYPES OF PERSONS INITIATING THESE SESSIONS IN 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE BACKGROUND FORM
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	N	SCHOOLS PROVIDING TRAINING SESSIONS		OF THOSE PROVIDING TRAINING SESSIONS, MEAN PERCENTAGE OF TRAINING SESSIONS INITIATED BY:		
POLICY OPTION LEA		N	%	IN-SCHOOL PERSONNEL	DISTRICT PERSONNEL	OTHERS
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools						
Adams County #12	16	10	62.5	33.3	63.3	3.3
Harrison County	30	19	63.3	6.8	82.6	10.6
Mesa	20	10	50.0	38.0	56.0	6.0
Newport	10	8	80.0	34.4	61.3	4.4
Racine	27	19	70.4	15.5	80.1	4.4
Santa Fe	16	13	81.3	15.0	77.7	7.3
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries						
Charlotte	56	43	76.8	20.2	75.7	4.1
Winston-Salem	25	22	88.0	22.1	71.0	6.9
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty						
Berkeley County	11	6	54.5	6.6	91.7	1.7
Boston	76	44	57.9	15.3	51.3	33.5
Houston	47	33	70.2	26.3	73.0	.7
Districts making primarily intra-school changes						
Alum Rock	17	11	64.7	79.1	17.9	3.0
Yonkers	24	9	37.5	18.8	68.8	12.5

TABLE C-13

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH TEACHERS PARTICIPATED IN A VARIETY OF OTHER SCHOOL-INITIATED STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT, 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION / POLICY OPTION — LEA	N	TYPE OF ACTIVITY: VISITS TO CLASSROOM BY TRAINERS		TEACHERS OBSERVING OTHER CLASSES		STAFF/SPECIALISTS CONSULTATIONS		STAFF EXCHANGE PROGRAMS		STAFF MEETINGS		COLLEGE COURSES	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools													
Adams County #12	16	6	37.5	8	50.0	10	62.5	1	6.3	13	81.3	5	31.3
Harrison County	30	15	50.0	16	53.3	25	83.3	8	26.7	23	76.7	1	3.3
Mesa	20	4	20.0	4	20.0	11	55.0	3	15.0	13	65.0	4	20.0
Newport	10	6	60.0	3	30.0	9	90.0	0	0	9	90.0	1	10.0
Racine	27	14	51.9	6	22.2	19	70.4	3	11.1	14	51.9	6	22.2
Santa Fe	16	9	56.3	12	75.0	12	75.0	5	31.3	13	81.3	6	37.5
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries													
Charlotte	56	31	55.4	34	60.7	48	85.7	7	12.5	49	87.5	2	3.6
Winston-Salem	25	14	56.0	16	64.0	17	68.0	9	36.0	21	84.0	1	4.0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty													
Berkeley County	11	3	27.3	3	27.3	6	54.6	1	9.1	4	36.4	0	0
Boston	76	27	35.5	12	15.8	48	63.2	6	7.9	49	64.5	14	18.4
Houston	47	26	55.3	25	53.2	40	85.1	6	12.8	37	78.7	4	8.5
Districts making primarily intra-school changes													
Alum Rock	17	10	58.8	11	64.7	12	70.6	2	11.8	16	94.1	6	35.3
Yonkers	24	6	25.0	3	12.5	14	58.3	3	12.5	18	75.0	2	8.3

TABLE C-14

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN THE EMPHASIS OF SCHOOL-INITIATED TRAINING SESSIONS[a]

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION		N		EMPHASIS		
POLICY OPTION	LEA	75-76	76-77	CHANGE IN MEAN AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES AND MATERIALS	CHANGE IN MEAN AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON SPECIAL NEEDS OF THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED	CHANGE IN MEAN AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON PLANNING AND USING RESOURCES
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools						
	Adams County #12	2	5	NA[b]	NA	NA
	Harrison County	7	7	3.5	3.5	13.4
	Mesa	3	7	-3.9	-0.4	2.3
	Newport	32	5	-27.4	-18.0	-21.8
	Racine	10	7	9.1	2.1	7.6
	Santa Fe	6	6	8.1	9.5	- 2.1
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries						
	Charlotte	26	27	-3.7	0.5	7.4
	Winston-Salem	9	14	-8.8	-9.0	- 1.1
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty						
	Berkeley County	2	2	NA	NA	NA
	Boston	14	20	6.8	-6.1	- 1.0
	Houston	36	18	2.9	2.2	1.6
Districts making primarily intra-school changes						
	Alum Rock	10	12	9.6	5.3	- 1.6
	Yonkers	2	NA	NA	NA	NA

[a] The items comprising the emphasis scales appear in Table C-26. The scores represent T-scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. A score of 50 represents the mean of site means, and a score of 60 represents one average standard deviation above the mean of means.

[b] NA indicates that data were not available or that the response to an item was insufficient (≤ 2) to permit interpretation and discussion. Where data were not available or sufficient in 1975-76, change is not analyzed.

TABLE C-15

EMPHASIS OF SCHOOL-INITIATED TRAINING SESSIONS IN 1976-77[a]
DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION		EMPHASIS								
		INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES AND MATERIALS			SPECIAL NEEDS OF THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED			PLANNING AND USING RESOURCES		
POLICY OPTION	LEA	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools										
	Adams County #12	5	36.9	21.6	5	52.7	10.7	5	57.5	14.0
	Harrison County	7	52.6	14.3	7	43.8	13.1	7	55.2	14.2
	Mesa	7	42.2	14.3	7	48.5	12.2	7	51.5	14.3
	Newport	5	32.1	10.8	5	44.6	15.7	5	43.0	19.2
	Racine	7	46.8	10.3	7	53.2	3.1	7	52.2	9.9
	Santa Fe	6	55.5	8.5	6	55.7	15.0	6	59.6	14.7
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries										
	Charlotte	27	52.9	14.0	27	49.5	14.4	27	55.4	9.8
	Winston-Salem	15	52.5	12.9	15	43.5	15.0	14	47.0	13.9
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty										
	Berkeley County	2	NA[b]	NA	2	NA	NA	2	NA	NA
	Boston	20	55.9	11.5	21	44.2	15.1	20	49.0	12.4
	Houston	18	54.1	14.9	18	52.6	10.3	18	54.7	14.3
Districts making primarily intra-school changes										
	Alum Rock	12	51.4	19.8	12	53.1	10.9	12	52.3	9.7
	Yonkers	6	50.1	10.7	6	46.2	19.4	6	50.1	19.8

[a] The items comprising the emphasis scales appear in Table C-26. The scores represent T-scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. A score of 50 represents the mean of site means, and a score of 60 represents one average standard deviation above the mean of means.

[b] NA indicates that data were not available or that the response to an item was insufficient (≤ 2) to permit interpretation and discussion.

TABLE C-16

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS INDICATING VARIOUS LOCATIONS FOR PROVIDING TITLE I LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION IN 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION / POLICY OPTION — LEA	LOCATION								OUTSIDE REGULAR CLASSROOM BUT IN REGULAR SCHOOL									
	GRADES 1-3				GRADES 4-6				GRADES 1-3					GRADES 4-6				
	N	REGULAR CLASSROOM	OUTSIDE CLASSROOM	AWAY FROM REGULAR SCHOOL	N	REGULAR CLASSROOM	OUTSIDE CLASSROOM	AWAY FROM REGULAR SCHOOL	N	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	ROOM SET ASIDE	LABORATORY OR LEARNING CENTER	ANNEX	N	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	ROOM SET ASIDE	LABORATORY OR LEARNING CENTER	ANNEX
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools																		
Adams County #12	16	0.0	100.0	0.0	NP*	NP	NP	NP	16	6.2	50.0	12.5	31.2	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Harrison County	30	0.0	96.7	3.3	30	0.0	93.3	6.7	30	3.3	93.3	3.3	0.0	30	3.3	90.0	3.3	3.3
Mesa	20	10.0	90.0	0.0	20	5.0	90.0	5.0	19	21.1	68.4	0.0	10.5	19	15.8	73.7	0.0	10.5
Newport	9	0.0	100.0	0.0	10	0.0	100.0	0.0	9	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	10	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0
Racine	22	0.0	100.0	0.0	22	4.5	95.5	0.0	22	18.2	77.3	4.5	0.0	22	13.6	81.8	4.5	0.0
Santa Fe	15	0.0	100.0	0.0	15	6.7	93.3	0.0	16	0.0	43.7	31.2	25.0	15	0.0	40.0	33.3	26.7
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries																		
Charlotte	37	0.0	100.0	0.0	44	0.0	100.0	0.0	37	0.0	37.8	27.0	35.1	43	0.0	41.9	30.2	27.9
Winston-Salem	16	6.2	93.7	0.0	21	0.0	100.0	0.0	15	0.0	20.0	26.7	53.3	22	0.0	22.7	36.4	40.9
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty																		
Berkeley County	11	18.2	81.8	0.0	9	22.2	77.8	0.0	10	0.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	8	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5
Boston	58	0.0	96.6	3.4	58	0.0	96.6	3.4	56	5.4	87.5	7.1	0.0	56	36.0	87.5	8.9	0.0
Houston	33	9.1	87.9	30.0	33	6.1	90.9	3.0	32	65.6	21.9	12.5	0.0	32	0.0	59.4	28.1	12.5
Districts making primarily intra-school changes																		
Alum Rock	16	81.2	18.7	0.0	16	81.2	18.7	0.0	6	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	6	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7
Yonkers	8	0.0	100.0	0.0	8	0.0	100.0	0.0	8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

*NP indicates that the program/service in question did not operate in the district.

TABLE C-17

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS USING VARIOUS CLASS SIZES IN PROVIDING TITLE I LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION BY DISTRICT

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION / POLICY OPTION / LEA	LANGUAGE ARTS													
	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASS, GRADES 1-3								NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASS, GRADES 4-6					
	N								N					
	75-76	76-77	1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-25	26+	75-76	76-77	1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-25	26+
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools																
Adams County #12	NA[a]	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Harrison County	21	30	-11.0	16.2	-10.4	10.0	-4.8	0.0	21	30	0.0	-7.1	3.3	5.2	-1.5	0.0
Mesa	10	20	-10.0	35.0	-10.0	0.0	0.0	-15.0	9	20	0.0	17.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	-17.2
Newport	NP[b]	9	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	4	10	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Racine	8	22	18.2	-18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8	22	9.1	-9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Santa Fe	10	16	0.0	1.2	8.7	0.0	-10.0	0.0	10	16	20.0	-17.5	15.0	0.0	-10.0	6.2
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries																
Charlotte	34	37	0.0	1.0	-6.2	2.5	2.7	0.0	36	43	0.0	0.1	-74.2	1.9	0.0	2.3
Winston-Salem	10	16	0.0	12.5	0.0	-12.5	0.0	0.0	12	22	4.5	4.5	0.0	-9.1	0.0	0.0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty																
Berkeley County	8	11	-12.5	-15.9	35.2	-3.4	-3.4	0.0	8	9	0.0	-62.5	54.2	9.7	-1.4	0.0
Boston	29	58	0.0	-3.5	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.7	27	58	0.0	1.2	-4.7	1.7	0.0	1.7
Houston	32	33	0.0	3.0	29.5	-32.4	-3.1	3.0	32	33	0.0	0.0	26.8	-35.8	6.0	3.0
Districts making primarily intra-school changes																
Alum Rock	6	16	0.0	0.0	6.2	20.8	6.2	-33.3	6	16	0.0	0.0	6.2	14.5	6.2	-27.1
Yonkers	5	9	0.0	-20.0	-15.6	11.1	13.3	11.1	5	9	0.0	-20.0	-28.9	2.2	13.3	33.3

[a] NA indicates that data were not currently available or that the response to an item was insufficient (≤ 2) to permit interpretation and discussion. Where data were not available or sufficient in one or both years, change is not analyzed.

[b] NP indicates that the program/service in question did not operate in the district. Where there was no program operating in 1975-76, change is not analyzed.

TABLE C-18

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS USING VARIOUS CLASS SIZES IN PROVIDING TITLE I LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION BY DISTRICT IN 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION / POLICY OPTION — LEA	LANGUAGE ARTS													
	NUMBER OF CHILDREN GRADES 1-3							NUMBER OF CHILDREN GRADES 4-6						
	N	1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-25	26+	N	1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-25	26+
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools														
Adams County #12	16	0.0	68.7	31.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Harrison County	30	3.3	40.0	46.7	10.0	0.0	0.0	30	0.0	16.7	70.0	10.0	3.3	0.0
Mesa	20	0.0	95.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	20	0.0	95.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Newport	9	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Racine	22	18.2	81.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22	9.1	90.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Santa Fe	16	0.0	81.2	18.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	16	20.0	62.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	6.2
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries														
Charlotte	37	0.0	21.6	70.3	5.4	2.7	0.0	43	0.0	14.0	79.1	4.7	0.0	2.3
Winston-Salem	16	0.0	12.5	0.0	87.5	0.0	0.0	22	4.5	4.5	0.0	90.9	0.0	0.0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty														
Berkeley County	11	0.0	9.1	72.7	9.1	9.1	0.0	9	0.0	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1	0.0
Boston	58	0.0	10.3	86.2	1.7	0.0	1.7	58	0.0	8.6	87.9	1.7	0.0	1.7
Houston	33	0.0	3.0	57.6	36.4	0.0	3.0	33	0.0	0.0	42.4	45.5	9.1	3.0
Districts making primarily intra-school changes														
Alum Rock	16	0.0	0.0	6.2	37.5	6.2	50.0	16	0.0	0.0	6.2	31.2	6.2	56.2
Yonkers	9	0.0	0.0	44.4	11.1	33.3	11.1	9	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	33.3

*NA indicates that data were not available, or that the number of responses is insufficient (≤2) to permit interpretation and discussion.

TABLE C-19

CHANGE FROM 1975-76 TO 1976-77 IN
LANGUAGE ARTS SCHEDULING VARIABLES

DATA SOURCE: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	MINUTES PER DAY			DAYS PER WEEK			WEEKS PER YEAR		
POLICY OPTION LEA	75-76	76-77	% CHANGE	75-76	76-77	% CHANGE	75-76	76-77	% CHANGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools									
Adams County #12	NA[a]	NA	NA	NA	4.8	NA	NA	21	NA
Harrison County	32	33	3	4	4	0	36	35	-3
Mesa	31	29	-6	4	4	0	35	33	-6
Newport	38	32	-16	4	4	0	36	30	-17
Racine	36	37	3	5	4	-20	36	36	0
Santa Fe	30	42	40	5	4	-20	36	33	-8
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries									
Charlotte	37	37	0	5	5	0	39	36	-8
Winston-Salem	43	48	12	5	5	0	36	36	0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty									
Berkeley County	53	37	-30	5	5	0	32	28	-13
Boston	41	50	22	5	5	0	36	36	0
Houston	36	35	-3	4	5	25	35	35	0
Districts making primarily intra-school changes									
Alum Rock	105	66	-37	5	5	0	36	36	0
Yonkers	37	56	51	4	3	-40	36	36	0

[a]NA indicates that data were not available or that the response to an item was insufficient (≤ 2) to permit interpretation and discussion. Where data were not available or insufficient in one or both years, change is not analyzed.

TABLE C-20

ITEMS IN THE INDIVIDUALLY PRESCRIBED ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS SCALE[a]

	WEIGHT[b]
1. Instructional Groups (4 = frequently, 1 = never)	
a. Adult and student in one-to-one relationship	+1
b. Adults with small groups (2 - 5)	+1
c. Individuals working independently under supervision	+1
d. Adults with large groups (20+)	-1
2. Percentage of Time Assigned to Tasks (0 -100):	
a. On individual basis	+.04
b. To total group	-.04
3. Materials and Equipment Used (4 = frequently, 1 = never)	
a. Textbooks	-1
b. Programmed materials	+1
c. Instructional games	+1
d. Audiovisual equipment	+1
e. Teaching machines	+1

[a] Once a raw score for a respondent was computed, it was transformed to a t-score, with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Thus, a score of 50 represents the mean of site means, and a score of 60 one standard deviation above the mean of means. The internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for this scale was .72.

[b] These weights were assigned a priori. They were intended to transform all variables to have approximately the same range.

TABLE C-21-1

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS MEASURES TO ASSESS PERFORMANCE LEVEL AT BEGINNING OF INSTRUCTION						
	STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES	STANDARDIZED DIAGNOSTIC TEST SCORES	DISTRICT/SCHOOL/ PROGRAM OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TEST SCORES	TEACHING STAFF OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TEST SCORES	INFORMAL TESTING	PREVIOUS YEAR'S GRADES	STUDENT'S AGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	-7	24	-24	-14	-7	6	-10
Harrison County	11	-1	-2	-15	-14	-4	-17
Mesa	-43	-43	3	18	13	-15	6
Newport	15	24	3	-3	0	-26	-8
Racine	-4	12	12	-16	-12	-1	-1
Santa Fe	64	5	-7	-45	-7	-13	-26
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	4	9	0	-2	4	-6	-1
Winston-Salem	0	-13	8	11	2	-18	-16
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	18	26	18	-42	-51	-34	31
Boston	-2	3	1	-4	1	1	-8
Houston	-4	-6	15	-12	-5	-8	-8
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	25	25	-12	0	0	38	0
Yonkers	3	17	17	13	-10	10	-2

TABLE C-21-2

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTIONS	CHANGE IN USE OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR THOSE USING SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES							
	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE STATING OBJECTIVES FOR			CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE BASING OBJECTIVES ON			CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS REPORTING ACCESS TO MATERIALS BASED ON PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
POLICY OPTION LEA		INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	SMALL GROUPS	TOTAL GROUP	CONTENT	MASTERY	BOTH CONTENT AND MASTERY	
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	-5	-17	10	6	-57	20	37	5
Harrison County	3	-10	3	7	-5	14	-10	-6
Mesa	9	27	-13	-14	-15	10	5	2
Newport	0	-6	6	0	-9	-1	11	2
Racine	-11	9	0	-9	-8	-16	24	5
Santa Fe	-7	37	-49	12	0	27	-27	-35
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	6	1	-2	2	2	4	-6	6
Winston-Salem	3	14	-6	-8	1	-2	0	-2
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	22	70	-60	-10	22	-12	-10	0
Boston	-2	-5	5	0	0	-4	5	0
Houston	7	18	-18	0	7	-4	-3	8
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	-5	20	-11	-9	0	8	-8	1
Yonkers	-4	-10	16	-6	0	-10	10	7

TABLE C-21-3

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTIONS POLICY OPTION LEA	CHANGE IN HOW TASKS ARE ASSIGNED TO STUDENTS (MEAN PERCENTAGE PER YEAR)			CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS UTILIZING MATERIALS IN VARIOUS WAYS			
	INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	SMALL GROUPS	TOTAL GROUPS	SAME MATERIALS SAME ORDER, SAME RATE	SAME MATERIALS SAME ORDER, DIFFERENT RATE	SAME MATERIALS DIFFERENT SEQUENCE	DIFFERENT MATERIALS FOR DIFFERENT CHILDREN
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	7	-11	4	6	-26	17	4
Harrison County	4	-3	-1	-10	5	21	-15
Mesa	-6	-11	16	-1	15	4	-18
Newport	-1	-5	6	0	6	12	-19
Racine	8	-11	-8	0	-20	-10	29
Santa Fe	9	-24	7	4	12	4	-20
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	-1	-1	2	2	-7	1	4
Winston-Salem	-8	5	0	0	8	17	-25
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	30	-7	-23	0	-20	27	-8
Boston	0	1	0	0	-3	-2	5
Houston	8	-6	-5	0	-5	-1	6
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	14	4	-18	-17	-12	7	21
Yonkers	4	1	-1	-7	5	2	-1

TABLE C-21-4

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS METHODS TO ASSESS PROGRESS DURING THE YEAR				
POLICY OPTION LEA	REVIEW HOMEWORK/ WORKBOOKS	SCORES ON OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TESTS	CLASS PARTICIPATION	STUDENT SELF-EVALUATION	METHODS
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools					
Adams County #12	14	-34	-9	0	28
Harrison County	22	-16	-17	6	5
Mesa	2	-12	6	-3	7
Newport	0	-6	0	0	6
Racine	-15	-5	6	4	10
Santa Fe	18	-32	41	0	-26
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries					
Charlotte	-3	3	-13	2	10
Winston-Salem	3	-28	20	3	3
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty					
Berkeley County	0	36	-46	0	10
Boston	0	-2	-12	-1	15
Houston	0	6	-12	-4	10
Districts making primarily intra-school changes					
Alum Rock	17	-42	0	0	25
Yonkers	-9	-3	-10	6	17

TABLE C-21-5

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS METHODS OF RECORDING STUDENTS' PROGRESS				CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS RECORDING STUDENTS' PROGRESS AT VARIOUS INTERVALS			
POLICY OPTION LEA	STUDENT FOLDERS	STUDENT FLOW CHARTS	RECORD FORMS PROVIDED WITH MATERIALS	COMPUTER TRACKING SYSTEM	FIVE TIMES WEEKLY	ONE TO FOUR TIMES WEEKLY	ONE TO THREE TIMES MONTHLY	LESS THAN MONTHLY
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	-12	29	-13	0	2	-14	-10	22
Harrison County	0	10	34	0	4	-9	11	-6
Mesa	-15	-20	12	3	4	-1	8	-12
Newport	0	58	-12	19	0	-6	6	0
Racine	-3	2	-6	3	-6	11	-2	-3
Santa Fe	5	11	-8	4	0	20	22	-41
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	5	4	11	5	12	-13	5	-4
Winston-Salem	8	-12	-12	-29	-20	1	19	0
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	15	-14	4	18	-10	-8	18	0
Boston	2	4	0	-1	-1	-1	1	2
Houston	4	-4	2	6	0	14	-8	-6
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	2	4	-20	0	12	-10	-1	0
Yonkers	16	28	-4	0	-3	-5	3	5

TABLE C-22-1

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS MEASURES TO ASSESS PERFORMANCE LEVEL AT BEGINNING OF INSTRUCTION						
	STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES	STANDARDIZED DIAGNOSTIC TEST SCORES	DISTRICT/SCHOOL/ PROGRAM OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TEST SCORES	TEACHING STAFF OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TEST SCORES	INFORMAL TESTING	PREVIOUS YEAR'S GRADES	STUDENT'S AGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	93	60	40	40	93	33	27
Harrison County	82	86	50	36	64	54	18
Mesa	18	9	96	59	68	4	14
Newport	100	86	57	43	100	43	7
Racine	83	90	90	52	52	17	21
Santa Fe	96	86	68	36	86	18	18
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	94	55	39	26	61	15	8
Winston-Salem	86	55	82	67	84	45	8
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	100	80	100	40	40	20	40
Boston	86	58	57	49	85	64	24
Houston	72	48	74	33	66	21	12
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	75	100	62	75	88	50	12
Yonkers	93	76	53	59	90	60	30

TABLE C-22-2

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTIONS	USE OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR THOSE USING SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES							
	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	PERCENTAGE STATING OBJECTIVES FOR			PERCENTAGE BASING OBJECTIVES ON			PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS REPORTING ACCESS TO MATERIALS BASED ON PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
POLICY OPTION LEA		INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	SMALL GROUPS	TOTAL GROUP	CONTENT	MASTERY	BOTH CONTENT AND MASTERY	
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	76	50	21	29	0	20	80	71
Harrison County	86	47	26	26	0	14	86	58
Mesa	96	60	10	31	7	21	71	95
Newport	100	94	6	0	6	6	88	94
Racine	81	89	6	4	5	5	91	98
Santa Fe	68	71	18	12	0	27	73	65
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	90	82	13	4	5	13	82	94
Winston-Salem	95	92	8	0	10	10	79	92
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	91	90	0	10	22	0	78	100
Boston	93	62	24	14	6	13	80	83
Houston	93	82	10	8	16	11	74	93
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	80	83	17	0	33	8	58	92
Yonkers	83	72	19	8	0	9	91	94

TABLE C-22-3

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTIONS	HOW TASKS ARE ASSIGNED TO STUDENTS (MEAN PERCENTAGE PER YEAR)			PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS UTILIZING MATERIALS IN VARIOUS WAYS			
POLICY OPTION LEA	INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	SMALL GROUPS	TOTAL GROUPS	SAME MATERIALS SAME ORDER, SAME RATE	SAME MATERIALS SAME ORDER, DIFFERENT RATE	SAME MATERIALS DIFFERENT SEQUENCE	DIFFERENT MATERIALS FOR DIFFERENT CHILDREN
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	36	28	36	6	24	29	41
Harrison County	38	18	44	0	36	36	27
Mesa	25	14	62	27	42	16	16
Newport	67	19	14	0	6	12	81
Racine	81	7	9	0	14	24	63
Santa Fe	53	22	25	4	12	16	68
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	62	22	16	5	19	16	60
Winston-Salem	56	31	12	0	20	46	33
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	71	20	9	0	9	27	64
Boston	40	38	22	2	22	22	54
Houston	48	27	24	4	15	27	53
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	58	29	13	0	38	15	46
Yonkers	61	19	20	2	9	12	77

TABLE C-22-4

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS METHODS TO ASSESS PROGRESS DURING THE YEAR				
POLICY OPTION LEA	REVIEW HOMEWORK/ WORKBOOKS	SCORES ON OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TESTS	CLASS PARTICIPATION	STUDENT SELF-EVALUATION	OTHER METHODS
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools					
Adams County #12	14	21	36	0	28
Harrison County	26	32	26	10	5
Mesa	2	74	17	0	7
Newport	0	94	0	0	6
Racine	10	56	17	6	10
Santa Fe	18	18	41	0	24
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries					
Charlotte	13	66	6	4	10
Winston-Salem	3	72	20	3	3
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty					
Berkeley County	0	80	10	0	10
Boston	18	41	24	2	15
Houston	4	68	15	3	10
Districts making primarily intra-school changes					
Alum Rock	17	58	0	0	25
Yonkers	3	53	22	6	17

TABLE C-22-5

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS: 1976-77
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALISTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS METHODS OF RECORDING STUDENTS' PROGRESS				PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS RECORDING STUDENTS' PROGRESS AT VARIOUS INTERVALS			
POLICY OPTION / LEA	STUDENT FOLDERS	STUDENT FLOW CHARTS	RECORD FORMS PROVIDED WITH MATERIALS	COMPUTER TRACKING SYSTEM	FIVE TIMES WEEKLY	ONE TO FOUR TIMES WEEKLY	ONE TO THREE TIMES MONTHLY	LESS THAN MONTHLY
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	88	47	41	0	11	22	44	22
Harrison County	100	23	73	0	4	36	36	23
Mesa	50	30	49	24	7	31	56	7
Newport	100	81	88	19	0	25	75	0
Racine	97	41	83	5	29	54	10	7
Santa Fe	96	20	56	4	12	32	28	28
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	97	34	93	6	28	42	25	5
Winston-Salem	93	32	80	22	42	24	32	2
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	100	9	73	18	36	46	18	0
Boston	95	33	56	2	20	33	38	8
Houston	93	[illegible]	62	17	12	58	28	2
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	71	43	64	0	50	36	14	0
Yonkers	91	37	67	0	19	45	31	5

TABLE C-11

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION
OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS
PROGRAMS FOR TITLE I STUDENTS

DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

INSTRUCTIONAL CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE OF REGULAR TEACHERS EMPLOYING CHARACTERISTIC		
	1976-77		CHANGE 1975-76 to 1976-77
	RANGE	MEDIAN	
1. Measures used to assess performance level at begining of instruction:			
Standardized achievement test scores	28-89	65.0	11
Standardized diagnostic test scores	33-67	48.0	7
Scores on district-, school-, or program-developed tests keyed to instructional objectives	11-95	48.0	1
Scores on teaching staff-developed tests keyed to instructional objectives	33-71	57.0	-5
Informal testing	65-100	87.0	1
Previous year's grades	23-89	53.0	-4
Student's age	7-48	19.0	-1
2. Use of performance objectives:			
Specific performance objectives used	68-96	84.0	-2
Of those using specific objectives, goals are set for:			
Each child	0-57	19.2	6
Small groups	21.0-79.7	52.8	33
Total group	3.7-57.1	27.3	-40
Of those using specific objectives, objectives are based on:			
Content	0-20	6.8	-1
Level of mastery	0-33.3	12.0	6
Both	58.3-100.0	76.2	-5
Of those using specific objectives, access to materials keyed to those objectives	44-86	71.0	10
3. How are tasks assigned:			
To whole class	45-77	59.4	7
To small groups	14-28	21.5	-6
To individual students	9-34	18.0	-6

(continues)

TABLE C-23, concluded

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION
OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS
PROGRAMS FOR TITLE I STUDENTS

DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

INSTRUCTIONAL CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE OF REGULAR TEACHERS EMPLOYING CHARACTERISTIC		
	1976-77		CHANGE 1975-76 to 1976-77
	RANGE	MEDIAN	
4. How materials are utilized:			
Same materials, same order, same rate	0-37.5	14.4	-4
Same materials, same order, different rate	21.2-55.6	40.0	6
Same materials, different sequence	0-16.7	14.3	-4
Different materials for different children	9.1-63.6	28.9	2
5. Measures used to assess students' progress during the year:			
Review homework/workbooks	10.3-56.9	25.9	3
Scores on objective referenced tests	13.7-61.7	41.5	-37
Class participation	0-27.8	20.0	4
Student self-evaluation	0- 8.3	1.3	1
6. Methods of recording students' progress			
Folders	68-98	86.0	-2
Flow charts	6-46	22.0	1
Record forms provided with materials	25-86	50.0	-2
Computer tracking system	0-15	1.0	1
7. Frequency of recording students' progress			
5 times a week	13.3-33.3	23.9	24
1-4 times a week	40.0-84.6	63.6	52
1-3 times a month	1.9-30.0	9.6	-47
Less than 1-3 times a month	0- 6.7	.3	-20

TABLE C-24-1

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS
FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION POLICY OPTION — LEA	CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS MEASURES TO ASSESS PERFORMANCE LEVEL AT BEGINNING OF INSTRUCTION						
	STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES	STANDARDIZED DIAGNOSTIC TEST SCORES	DISTRICT/SCHOOL/ PROGRAM OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TEST SCORES	TEACHING STAFF OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TEST SCORES	INFORMAL TESTING	PREVIOUS YEAR'S GRADES	STUDENT'S AGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	8	-12	23	-18	-10	32	-39
Harrison County	7	19	4	2	-14	10	9
Mesa	-1	-8	-2	-12	-2	14	11
Newport	22	45	4	31	34	-27	31
Racine	4	14	1	-2	18	-27	13
Santa Fe	-21	0	-20	-14	9	-6	3
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	2	-2	-5	1	-3	-18	0
Winston-Salem	-12	10	-8	-12	-14	6	-14
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	38	41	1	15	5	-9	41
Boston	10	25	-11	-35	-11	27	-15
Houston	6	4	24	6	0	2	0
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	-15	-1	0	-14	-13	-30	-10
Yonkers	24	8	-4	-13	2	14	-10

TABLE C-24-2

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS
FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTIONS POLICY OPTION LEA	USE OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR THOSE USING SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES							
	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	PERCENTAGE STATING OBJECTIVES FOR			PERCENTAGE BASING OBJECTIVES ON			PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS REPORTING ACCESS TO MATERIALS BASED ON PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
		INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	SMALL GROUPS	TOTAL GROUP	CONTENT	MASTERY	BOTH CONTENT AND MASTERY	
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	-21	23	30	-53	20	-18	-2	3
Harrison County	10	-16	31	-15	-2	18	-16	29
Mesa	-13	-1	26	-25	-5	5	0	-5
Newport	-12	57	21	-79	-11	0	11	-3
Racine	1	--	26	-40	4	19	-23	7
Santa Fe	2	33	8	-28	-7	-20	27	5
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	-5	16	35	-51	6	0	-6	6
Winston-Salem	4	-5	73	-68	-9	7	2	-4
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	6	-13	27	-7	-2	33	-32	17
Boston	2	-25	--	--	-8	14	-6	27
Houston	3	-4	21	-17	4	2	-5	4
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	-11	--	52	-72	-3	11	-8	-2
Yonkers	-2	20	--	--	-8	12	-4	-3

TABLE C-24-3

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS
FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTIONS POLICY OPTION LEA	HOW TASKS ARE ASSIGNED TO STUDENTS (MEAN PERCENTAGE PER YEAR)			PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS UTILIZING MATERIALS IN VARIOUS WAYS			
	INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	SMALL GROUPS	TOTAL GROUPS	SAME MATERIALS SAME ORDER, SAME RATE	SAME MATERIALS SAME ORDER, DIFFERENT RATE	SAME MATERIALS DIFFERENT SEQUENCE	DIFFERENT MATERIALS FOR DIFFERENT CHILDREN
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	-29	-2	33	9	12	-26	1
Harrison County	-6	1	5	6	-2	-3	-1
Mesa	-6	2	5	-14	15	-6	5
Newport	-3	-27	30	12	-13	-14	15
Racine	-2	-25	13	11	-20	15	-3
Santa Fe	2	1	-6	-3	14	8	-19
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	0	-1	0	0	-1	1	-3
Winston-Salem	-6	-10	6	15	14	-12	-15
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	-13	0	11	-26	6	10	6
Boston	-8	-4	8	-7	32	-8	-17
Houston	-2	-6	8	6	-3	-3	2
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	-15	-7	19	4	21	0	-13
Yonkers	4	0	0	-5	-10	-6	22

199

TABLE C-24-4

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS
FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS METHODS TO ASSESS PROGRESS DURING THE YEAR				
POLICY OPTION / LEA	REVIEW HOMEWORK/ WORKBOOKS	SCORES ON OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TESTS	CLASS PARTICIPATION	STUDENT SELF-EVALUATION	METHODS
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools					
Adams County #12	4	48	-20	0	-31
Harrison County	-1	-12	6	-4	7
Mesa	21	-22	8	4	-11
Newport	-7	-7	13	-13	7
Racine	34	-17	11	0	-6
Santa Fe	-10	6	13	-7	-2
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries					
Charlotte	0	22	-23	-1	0
Winston-Salem	11	-11	4	0	5
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty					
Berkeley County	16	-39	13	0	10
Boston	7	36	-22	0	-21
Houston	-2	19	-3	0	-14
Districts making primarily intra-school changes					
Alum Rock	-13	20	4	1	-13
Yonkers	6	-7	13	-3	-9

TABLE C-34-5

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77 MINUS 1975-76

DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES

SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS METHODS OF RECORDING STUDENTS' PROGRESS				PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS RECORDING STUDENTS' PROGRESS AT VARIOUS INTERVALS			
POLICY OPTION LEA	STUDENT FOLDERS	STUDENT FLOW CHARTS	RECORD FORMS PROVIDED WITH MATERIALS	COMPUTER TRACKING SYSTEM	FIVE TIMES WEEKLY	ONE TO FOUR TIMES WEEKLY	ONE TO THREE TIMES MONTHLY	LESS THAN MONTHLY
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	-12	-30	6	0	15	51	-48	-18
Harrison County	10	0	28	0	14	79	-76	-17
Mesa	-13	9	-19	1	8	59	-40	-26
Newport	-12	18	-15	0	18	24	-22	-20
Racine	1	-4	-37	15	26	36	-37	-25
Santa Fe	-8	6	0	0	25	44	-44	-25
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	0	5	23	2	17	56	-62	-12
Winston-Salem	-2	10	6	1	24	49	-56	-17
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	11	17	-10	-3	31	56	-87	0
Boston	-6	0	-1	0	30	27	-39	-18
Houston	7	5	-6	6	16	68	-65	-19
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	10	2	10	1	13	60	-20	-53
Yonkers	-12	3	18	0	25	30	-23	-32

TABLE C-25-1

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS
FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION / POLICY OPTION — LEA	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS MEASURES TO ASSESS PERFORMANCE LEVEL AT BEGINNING OF INSTRUCTION						
	STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES	STANDARDIZED DIAGNOSTIC TEST SCORES	DISTRICT/SCHOOL/ PROGRAM OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TEST SCORES	TEACHING STAFF OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TEST SCORES	INFORMAL TESTING	PREVIOUS YEAR'S GRADES	STUDENT'S AGE
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	28	48	83	62	90	72	11
Harrison County	58	50	32	48	72	76	32
Mesa	33	33	95	54	79	36	18
Newport	82	65	44	71	94	53	31
Racine	66	58	76	48	68	48	19
Santa Fe	33	40	29	67	90	40	22
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	51	52	37	65	89	39	13
Winston-Salem	35	38	69	57	76	71	7
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	78	61	48	35	65	78	48
Boston	89	67	11	33	100	89	11
Houston	69	48	57	62	83	46	25
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	65	46	60	66	87	23	10
Yonkers	82	39	33	45	91	61	22

TABLE C-25-2

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS
FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTIONS POLICY OPTION LEA	USE OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR THOSE USING SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES							
	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	PERCENTAGE STATING OBJECTIVES FOR			PERCENTAGE BASING OBJECTIVES ON			PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS REPORTING ACCESS TO MATERIALS BASED ON PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
		INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	SMALL GROUPS	TOTAL GROUP	CONTENT	MASTERY	BOTH CONTENT AND MASTERY	
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	79	23	50	27	20	7	73	78
Harrison County	82	17	54	29	4	23	73	72
Mesa	68	19	46	35	0	25	75	77
Newport	88	57	21	21	9	0	91	57
Racine	82	14	43	43	4	19	77	69
Santa Fe	88	33	53	14	0	0	100	66
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	75	23	61	16	14	9	77	78
Winston-Salem	96	8	80	12	7	10	84	84
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	87	5	55	40	8	33	58	60
Boston	89	0	43	57	0	33	67	86
Houston	84	10	60	30	10	25	65	64
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	89	38	52	10	13	11	76	71
Yonkers	82	33	63	4	0	12	88	44

TABLE C-25-3

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS
FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77
DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES
SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTIONS	HOW TASKS ARE ASSIGNED TO STUDENTS (MEAN PERCENTAGE PER YEAR)			PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS UTILIZING MATERIALS IN VARIOUS WAYS			
POLICY OPTION LEA	INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	SMALL GROUPS	TOTAL GROUPS	SAME MATERIALS SAME ORDER, SAME RATE	SAME MATERIALS SAME ORDER, DIFFERENT RATE	SAME MATERIALS DIFFERENT SEQUENCE	DIFFERENT MATERIALS FOR DIFFERENT CHILDREN
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools							
Adams County #12	11	21	68	29	32	14	21
Harrison County	16	15	69	28	40	14	18
Mesa	18	23	58	5	46	13	36
Newport	26	17	57	12	47	6	35
Racine	17	15	66	36	36	15	10
Santa Fe	26	26	47	2	50	19	29
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries							
Charlotte	25	28	49	14	33	12	37
Winston-Salem	14	23	63	38	41	13	9
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty							
Berkeley County	9	14	77	21	46	17	13
Boston	14	23	63	11	56	0	33
Houston	19	22	59	16	34	20	29
Districts making primarily intra-school changes							
Alum Rock	27	21	51	11	34	20	34
Yonkers	34	24	45	0	21	15	64

TABLE C-25-4

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES

SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS METHODS TO ASSESS PROGRESS DURING THE YEAR				
POLICY OPTION / LEA	REVIEW HOMEWORK/ WORKBOOKS	SCORES ON OBJECTIVE REFERENCED TESTS	CLASS PARTICIPATION	STUDENT SELF-EVALUATION	OTHER METHODS
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools					
Adams County #12	44	43	0	0	9
Harrison County	24	42	24	0	7
Mesa	44	20	20	4	12
Newport	33	33	13	7	7
Racine	57	14	12	0	18
Santa Fe	14	33	28	8	17
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries					
Charlotte	12	49	23	3	12
Winston-Salem	22	59	12	0	7
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty					
Berkeley County	30	40	20	0	10
Boston	29	57	14	0	0
Houston	10	62	21	2	6
Districts making primarily intra-school changes					
Alum Rock	20	47	17	1	13
Yonkers	26	33	26	4	11

TABLE C-25-5

DIMENSIONS CHARACTERIZING INDIVIDUALIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR EDUCATION LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS FOR TITLE I STUDENTS: 1976-77

DATA SOURCE: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION MODULES

SAMPLE: ALL REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS OF SAMPLE TITLE I STUDENTS

LEAs GROUPED BY SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY POLICY OPTION	PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS USING VARIOUS METHODS OF RECORDING STUDENTS' PROGRESS				PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALISTS RECORDING STUDENTS' PROGRESS AT VARIOUS INTERVALS			
POLICY OPTION / LEA	STUDENT FOLDERS	STUDENT FLOW CHARTS	RECORD FORMS PROVIDED WITH MATERIALS	COMPUTER TRACKING SYSTEM	FIVE TIMES WEEKLY	ONE TO FOUR TIMES WEEKLY	ONE TO THREE TIMES MONTHLY	LESS THAN MONTHLY
Districts that serve low-achieving students in all elementary schools								
Adams County #12	68	30	86	0	15	71	12	2
Harrison County	88	6	42	0	13	85	2	0
Mesa	77	46	33	8	14	68	16	2
Newport	88	18	65	0	18	64	18	0
Racine	82	15	44	15	26	68	7	[illegible]
Santa Fe	86	27	48	0	31	58	10	2
Districts that rank schools by achievement and serve fewer than all elementaries								
Charlotte	98	20	50	2	24	63	11	2
Winston-Salem	86	13	79	1	28	61	10	1
Districts that rank schools primarily by poverty								
Berkeley County	78	30	50	4	31	63	6	0
Boston	78	22	33	0	33	58	8	0
Houston	95	18	25	8	16	80	4	0
Districts making primarily intra-school changes								
Alum Rock	90	35	77	1	13	73	7	7
Yonkers	88	36	62	0	30	40	30	0

TABLE C-26

ITEMS USED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
INDEX OF EMPHASIS OF TRAINING SESSIONS

ITEM NUMBER	ITEM	RESPONSE	RESPONSE CODE
A	New Instructional Techniques	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1
B	New Content Material	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1
C	Utilization of Instructional Equipment and Materials	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1
D	Measurement Evaluation and Reporting	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1
H	Project Planning and Design	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1
I	Utilization of Anciliary Services (e.g., counseling or other non-instructional services)	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1
J	Utilization of Other Resources (e.g., library, community)	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1
F	Culture and Personality of Educationally Disadvantaged	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1
G	Types of Learning Disabilities	A great deal	4
		Some	3
		Little	2
		None	1

APPENDIX D

DISTRICT SUMMARIES

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Adams County #12

In 1976-77 Adams County School District #12 adopted the direct allocation approach to resource distribution, i.e., serving low-achieving students in all elementary schools. Under this procedure the district moved from serving three public elementary schools in 1975-76 to serving all 16 of these schools in 1976-77. Student selection was still based on achievement testing, though a different test was used and the cutoff percentile for eligibility was lowered from 50 to 25. The number of public school elementary students who received Title I reading instruction increased from 216 in 1975-76 to 784 in 1976-77, a 263% increase.

During 1976-77 Adams County #12 shifted its Title I program from serving grades 1-12 to serving grades 1-3 only, which accounts for the large increase in number of elementary students served. In addition, resources provided by the district to supplement Title I activities in 1975-76 were formalized into a district program serving those grades which no longer received Title I services. This contributed to the large increase of Title I expenditures relative to estimated total costs. The district's Title I allocation was reduced in 1976-77 because of demographic changes in surrounding LEAs, causing Adams County #12 to use up a substantial portion of its carry-over. Allocation for 1977-78 will increase to slightly above the 1975-76 level. The district has stated that it cannot afford to continue its expansion of Title I services after the Demonstration and will probably offer language arts in grades 1-6 with increased teacher/student ratios.

The transition from the 1975-76 Title I program to the 1976-77 Demonstration project in the district closely followed the district proposal and was accomplished smoothly.

The focus of the program changed from remediation in reading and math across a broad grade span to remedial reading in grades 1 to 3 only. Reading instruction was individualized through the Elementary PAL (Pupils Advancing in Learning) approach previously developed and used by the district. The Title I math component was eliminated in 1976-77.

Parental attendance at Title I PAC meetings has increased dramatically over the past four years. The District PAC has maintained a resource room open to all Title I parents in a centrally located administration building. A Parent Coordinator has contacted Title I parents when their children have entered the program to encourage the use of the parent resource facilities and to encourage participation in the parents' local PAC.

Title I staff in Adams County #12 report that businesses in the area have cooperated with the Title I program and have been generous in donation of equipment and time off for employees with Title I children to attend PAC functions. The community press has covered special Title I functions.

In addition to Title I, the district continued to operate another federally funded compensatory education program in 1976-77. Title VII, a bilingual, multicultural program, served children in two schools which were also Title I schools, but the two programs functioned autonomously.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Alum Rock

In 1976-77 the Alum Rock school district allocated Title I funds to all 25 of the district elementary and middle schools, in contrast to the 12 which had qualified under poverty criteria in the previous year. Half of the district schools were designated as "saturated" schools, in which all students were considered eligible for Title I services. The remaining schools were designated as "concentrated" schools, in which only "educationally disadvantaged" students were to receive Title I compensatory services. (According to California definitions, 84% of Alum Rock's students are "educationally disadvantaged.") As in previous years, all students who received compensatory instruction, including Title I, received it in their regular classrooms from their regular teachers.

In 1976-77 Alum Rock operated the following categorical compensatory education programs: Title I, Early Childhood Education, ESAA, Indian Education, Title IV-B, Bilingual Education, State Incentive Funds, and S.B.-90 (Educationally Disadvantaged Youth). The Miller-Unruh Reading Program and the Internal Voucher program were discontinued in the same year. ESAA and Indian Education were new in that year. Because of the decentralized administrative procedures used in Alum Rock, funds from all of these programs were consolidated and distributed among schools according to various criteria. Except for those programs which had specific pedagogical objectives, the activities of compensatory programs were merged or indistinguishable from one another.

Because the Title I program in Alum Rock was not organized around components, no table of changes is presented

here as for the other Demonstration districts. Title I served 5,288 students in 1975-76 and 12,382 in 1976-77, while reducing expenditures for instruction by 2%. Because of the organization noted above, however, it is impossible to attribute the district's ability to substantially increase the students served to specific factors such as redistribution of resources, use of carry-over, etc.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Berkeley County

In 1976-77 all elementary schools in Berkeley County were deemed eligible for Title I funds, including four schools which had not been eligible in 1975-76. However, only one of these additional schools, which was newly constructed, was targeted to receive funds along with the ten that had received funds in 1975-76. While more students were served in 1976-77 than in the previous year, Title I expenditures for elementary instruction increased by only 2% over that time. The chief factor that enabled Berkeley County to provide more services in 1976-77 was the increase in class size in the reading and math labs from four to nine students.

The Demonstration afforded Berkeley County an opportunity to restructure and standardize Title I management and planning procedures. In 1975-76 a single achievement test was chosen to be used in all target schools, thereby helping to standardize the student selection process across schools. Instructional lab lengths were also standardized and a new system for recording students' progress in labs was developed. During 1976-77 these and related improvements were implemented.

The services offered in 1976-77 were essentially the same as in the previous year. Reading and math labs and tutoring by classroom aides were continued, with the improvements mentioned above. The Special Education component was dropped, however.

The district and local PACs did not receive any Title I funds in either year. Whereas in 1975-76 the PACs' roles were confined largely to traditional kinds of volunteer help (e.g., field trips, class parties, etc.), in 1976-77 PAC members reported participation in decision

making in the areas of pupil needs assessment, planning, and evaluation.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Boston

In 1976-77 schools in Boston were chosen for Title I eligibility primarily according to their ranks on poverty measures. Only minor changes were made in the poverty ranking procedure which had been used the previous year. After schools had been chosen by poverty rank and a few others deemed eligible under a "hold harmless" provision, remaining schools were ranked on three achievement measures. Several schools which had not qualified for Title I funds under poverty measures were eligible under achievement criteria. All eligible schools received funds. In 1976-77 there was an 11% increase over the previous year in the number of elementary school students served by Title I. The operation of Title I services in Boston remained virtually unchanged from 1975-76 to 1976-77.

In 1976-77 Boston's Title I expenditures for elementary instruction were 9% higher than in the previous year. The increased expenditure can be accounted for almost entirely by an increase in carry-over usage. In fact, the amount of carry-over declined from $2,275,000 into 1976-77 to $64,000 into 1977-78. Thus, assuming that there is no substantial increase in Title I allocation, it does not appear that the Title I program as presently constituted can be continued beyond 1977-78.

The Boston school system received federal funds for two new education programs in 1976-77. Title IV-C is an ESEA-funded program concerned with second language learning. Vietnamese-Cambodian Refugee Assistance is a program of special services to refugee children funded by the Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act.

In 1976-77 Boston continued to report a high degree of parental involvement in school affairs. In April and June of 1977 Boston's City-Wide PAC held meetings during which the issue of funding the Demonstration for 1977-78 was discussed. A major cutback in Title I funds was anticipated and many PAC members felt that the Demonstration was not a priority of Boston's Title I program. The final vote was 18 to 16 in favor of recommending to the School Committee that the Demonstration be funded.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Charlotte

In 1976-77 the Charlotte Title I program changed from poverty to achievement criteria to determine school eligibility. Moreover, eligibility for reading and math instruction was determined separately. Although some schools lost services under the new criteria, the total number of schools receiving services was greater. All eligible schools received services in both school years.

While the Charlotte Title I program served 10% more elementary students in 1976-77 than it had in the previous year, expenditures for elementary instruction increased by only 1%. The expansion of services was made possible, in part, by SAFA funds which were used to supplement Title I in five Title I schools.

The focus of Charlotte's Title I program in 1976-77 continued to be elementary reading and math. While the number of students receiving Title I reading instruction declined slightly, the reading program was expanded to more schools. The math program served both more students and more schools.

Two new elementary schools opened in Charlotte in August 1976. Since Title I eligibility for schools in the district had already been established and submitted to NIE, the eligibility of these schools was established separately and services for these schools were funded by SAFA (Student Assistance to Federally Affected Areas) monies which came to the district in September 1976.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Harrison County

In 1976-77 the Harrison County school district adopted the direct allocation approach to resource distribution, i.e., serving low-achieving students in all elementary schools. The district actually used two criteria to determine school eligibility, a poverty criterion and an achievement criterion. Since every school in the district was determined to be eligible, the net effect was indistinguishable from a direct allocation procedure which simply posited that all schools were eligible. Students in all schools were served.

Of the 1,907 children receiving reading instruction in 1976-77, about 40 were in the seventh grade and would not have been served under the previous year's program. The operation of Title I instruction remained essentially the same, except that summer school instruction was dropped.

Despite a 32% increase in the number of elementary students served by Title I in 1976-77, Harrison County was able to maintain its level of per pupil Title I expenditure. This is due to the fact that Harrison County used only 79% of its 1975-76 allocation, thus building up carryover funds to be used during the following year. In addition, it received a 7.3% increase in allocation. It appears that Harrison County's current Title I program is sustainable after the Demonstration.

Administrators, teachers, principals, and parents expressed support for the Demonstration. In the course of the Demonstration there was a noticeable increase in parent involvement in the schools, according to district administrators. PAC members generally supported the 1976-77 changes in allocation policy and resource distribution.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Houston

In 1976-77, Houston ranked schools primarily by poverty; however, achievement criteria were used to some extent. This allocation option was chosen as a result of Houston's exploration of the achievement-only allocation option during the planning year, which revealed that ranking by achivement would cause a significant number of schools to lose Title I funding. Under this procedure, Houston moved from serving 54 elementary and 6 secondary schools in 1975-76 to serving 58 elementary schools in 1976-77. Eleven of the 58 were held-harmless under poverty criteria; 43 were eligible whether poverty or achievement criteria were used, and four were eligible on the basis of achievement criteria only.

Student selection was still based on achievement testing and teacher judgment. However, the cutoff percentile for eligibility on the achievement test was lowered and the degree to which teacher judgment was used was significantly restricted. Under these changes in student selection criteria, the number of elementary students served decreased from 25,502 in 1975-76 to 23,200 in 1976-77, a decrease of 9%. Further, no secondary students were eligible for Title I services in 1976-77.

Perhaps the most notable change for 1976-77 that is related to allocation and the Demonstration is in the internal allocation of Title I resources among the targeted schools. In 1975-76, State interpretations of the concentration requirements of the federal legislation were quite stringent. As a result, the highest ranked schools were often overloaded with Title I program components, i.e., services, regardless of the needs of the specific students

in the particular school. In 1976-77, the State was persuaded to relax its interpretation of the concentration regulations, and a new procedure was adopted. This procedure allocates school Title I dollars on the basis of the number of students scoring below the achievement cutoff point in a school, multiplied by a constant dollar figure. Using the total dollars available as a budget, the principal, together with a committee of teachers and parents, consults a catalogue of Title I services, complete with price of each service. From the catalogue, services appropriate to and affordable by the school are then purchased. (This procedure has proven so successful and popular that it is being continued in 1977-78 and after the Demonstration ends.)

While the number of elementary students served decreased 9% in 1976-77, elementary expenditures increase 18%. This was accomplished mainly by an increased Title I allocation (5%) and a redistribution of Title I expenditures from secondary instruction to elementary instruction. Thus, unit costs per student and per student FTE increased in Houston in 1976-77. The increase in elementary expenditures was necessitated by an approximate 10% increase in personnel salaries as well as by a large increase in fringe benefits. Also, administrative expenditures increased by approximately 18% in 1976-77.

The transition from the 1975-76 Title I program to the 1976-77 program closely followed the district proposal and was accomplished smoothly. The mix of services changed very little. However, the grade span focus changed from elementary and secondary to elementary only.

Parent involvement was a special thrust of the 1976-77 Houston Title I program, and a Parent Coordinator was hired especially to deal with this issue. The Coordinator made special efforts to increase parent participation in

PAC as well as in the classroom by means of parent workshops, regular newsletters, and presentations at PAC meetings. In addition, one of the most important roles of the Coordinator was that of home-school liaison.

In addition to Title I, the district continued to operate several other compensatory programs, principally, Follow Through at the elementary level, and ESAA and the state compensatory program (SCE) in the secondary grades. There is little formal coordination between Follow Through and Title I, although the two programs overlap considerably (often operating in the same schools). However, Title I and the SCE program are closely coordinated, with the SCE effort structured in such a way as to provide continuation of services to Title I-type children at the secondary level. THe ESAA and Title I programs are not closely coordinated in the same sense as the Title I and SCE programs, especially since ESAA focuses on inservice efforts.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Mesa

In 1976-77 the Mesa school district adopted the direct allocation policy option, i.e., serving low-achieving students in all elementary schools. The number of elementary schools receiving Title I services increased from 13 in 1975-76 to 25 in 1976-77. In both years students were selected on the basis of their scores on district-devised criterion referenced tests. Teacher judgment also played an important role in the placement of students in the Title I program in both years.

While the number of elementary students receiving Title I services increased by 32%, from 2,494 in 1975-76 to 3,289 in 1976-77, expenditures for elementary instruction declined 2% in the Demonstration year. The increase in the number of students served was made possible, in part, by decreasing the amount of services received by the average student.

There were few changes in program administration in 1976-77. The Reading Clinic was no longer funded by Title I and the senior high math component was reduced. Mesa was the only district in the study to provide Title I instruction in both reading and math to grades 1-12 in the Demonstration year.

Mesa is a particularly interesting site from the perspective of funding level. While Title I expenditures decreased 7.3% in 1976-77, the Title I allocation increased 21% as a result of an increased poverty count which, in turn, was a result of rapidly increasing school enrollment. Thus, carry-over funds into 1977-78 were 63% greater than carry-over into 1976-77.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Newport

In 1976-77 the Newport school district adopted the direct allocation approach to resource distribution, i.e., serving low-achieving students in all elementary schools. Using this approach the district expanded its elementary Title I program from three schools in 1975-76 to nine in 1976-77.* Student eligibility was still based on achievement testing, though a different test was used than in the previous year. Student targeting was based on a complex formula involving achievement scores, ability measures, and teacher judgment, although less reliance was placed on the latter than in previous years. The formula included an estimate of a student's "capacity achievement gap," i.e., the difference between ability and performance as measured by standardized tests. Under the new allocation procedures the district served almost twice the number of elementary students served in the previous year.

Expenditures for elementary Title I instruction in 1976-77 increased by a greater percentage than did the number of students served. The increase in expenditures can be accounted for almost entirely by a change in carry-over usage, with increases in allocation and redistribution of resources within Title I contributing only nominally to the increase.

In 1976-77 Title I continued to be closely coordinated with the state/local compensatory program, Section 4. Administrative changes in grade levels covered by particular Title I activity units were made. In 1975-76, Title I remedial reading was offered only in grades 4-6 in Title I eligible schools. Section 4 was offered in grades 1-3 in

---

*An additional 6th grade elementary school was also served in both years.

all schools. The major administrative change made by Newport was the integration of both programs at all elementary grade levels. That is, staff and resources were pooled to provide a single compensatory program for targeted students. There was no major change, however, in the orientation of the Title I program, with reading continuing to be the sole instructional component. The senior high remedial reading activity unit was dropped one-third of the way through the school year. According to program administrators, this decision was made in part because of problems with implementation and the difficulty of providing supplementary experiences at that grade level. It was also in keeping with the elementary focus of the compensatory effort.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Racine

In 1976-77 the Racine school district adopted the direct allocation approach to resource distribution. All elementary schools in the district were eligible for Title I services, and 29 of 33 offered Title I services. The other four schools were eligible for funding under the state-funded SEN (Special Educational Needs) program, which offered compensatory instruction comparable to that of Title I. While Title I had served 600 elementary school pupils in 1975-76, it served 1,264 in 1976-77, an increase of 111%.

In the Demonstration year Racine increased its Title I expenditures for elementary instruction by 90%. That the increase in pupils served was proportionately larger than the increase in expenditures was due in part to the increase in compensatory instruction group size in the Demonstration year. The district also reported hiring more specialists in 1976-77 than in the previous year, as specialists in 1976-77 as well as aides were responsible for direct classroom teaching.

The increase in expenditures for elementary instruction can be accounted for in large measure, however, by a redistribution of resources within Title I. Racine's Title I allocation remained unchanged, and little change in the use of carry-over funds occurred. Several components were dropped from the Title I program in order to concentrate services in the elementary reading component. The Kindergarten Follow Upward component and the Junior High Reading component were dropped in 1976-77, while the Taylor Children's Home, Hilltop Preschool, and PAC components continued to be funded. Compensatory reading in grades 7-10 in 1976-77 continued under funding from ESAA, which had formerly funded

a Human Relations Program. Two other federally funded compensatory programs, Head Start and Title VII, continued to operate in Racine in 1976-77.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Santa Fe

In 1976-77 the Santa Fe school district adopted the direct allocation approach to resource distribution, i.e., serving low-achieving students in all elementary schools. Using this procedure, the district moved from serving 11 public elementary schools in 1975-76 to serving all 16 of these schools in 1976-77. Student selection was still based on achievement testing, though a different test was used at the elementary level in 1976-77, and less emphasis was placed on teacher referrals than in the previous year. The number of elementary students served overall increased from 848 to 1,329, a 57% increase. This increase in students served was supported by a relatively large increase in allocation (11%) and a redistribution of resources within Title I, mainly from equipment and auxiliary services expenditures to elementary instruction. In addition, the average daily length of instruction was decreased and total equipment expenditures were reduced by an amount sufficient to employ five aides, who played an important role in the delivery of instruction.

Santa Fe's 1975-76 Title I program offered reading instruction in grades 1-8. In 1976-77 math instruction for grades 7 and 8 was added; the reading effort continued to operate much as it had in the previous year. The math instruction was added in response to concerns expressed by teachers, principals, and parents that many students' scores on the math portion of the Westinghouse Learning Corporation (WLC) test were as low as or lower than their reading scores. The math component, which served 52 students in two junior high schools, was largely unrelated to the allocation option chosen by the district. Media services were also added to

the Title I program in 1976-77. In 1977-78 the district hired a media specialist and further expanded the scope of media services.

In addition to Title I, in 1976-77 the Santa Fe school district continued to operate federally funded programs in Community Development, ESAA, Title XX, and Follow Through programs and a Bilingual, Multicultural Program funded jointly by federal, state, and local monies. New programs for the 1976-77 school year included the federally funded Title IV Indian Education program and the Right-to-Read program. Right-to-Read was not new to the district, but had not been funded in 1975-76; in 1976-77 it received federal, state, and local funding. Despite the continued presence or addition of these several compensatory programs, the Title I program in Santa Fe continued its largely independent operation.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Winston-Salem

In 1976-77, the Winston-Salem school district changed from a poverty to an achievement criterion for determining school eligibility for Title I. While three schools which had Title I in 1975 did not qualify the next year, 14 schools which did not have Title I in 1975-76 qualified under the new rules. All eligible schools received funds. The number of elementary students receiving Title I instruction increased by 75% in 1976-77.

School eligibility at the elementary level was determined by the same set of measures used for student selection in 1975-76. The decision to continue the use of these criteria, however, followed and was the solution to a problem which centered around testing in the district. In the spring of 1976 CTBS tests were adminstered to all elementary schools in place of the previously used MATs. Reranking of schools based on the results of that data would have caused a dramatic change in school eligibility. Twenty-one of 24 participating schools would have lost services in 1976-77. Title I administrators felt that such a drastic alteration to the program would be confusing and would sacrifice its stability. They therefore chose to use MAT scores which had been collected for 1975-76. In the spring of 1977 the CTBS was again administered with similar results. Only five of the schools served in 1976-77 would have continued to be eligible if these test results were used, and once again it was decided to continue services to schools previously eligible and served.

In 1976-77 expenditures for elementary instruction were 55% higher than in the previous year. About one-quarter of this increase can be attributed to an increase in allocation, another quarter to a redistribution of resources

within Title I, and about half to a change in carry-over usage.

Title I remained the only compensatory program operating in Winston-Salem during 1976-77. There were few changes in program organization, except for the kindergarten and programmed tutoring components. The kindergarten component was dropped because kindergarten services became state supported. Programmed tutoring, which had served students in grades 1-6 in 1975-76, was confined to the sixth grade in 1976-77. The Multi Media Reading Lab (MMRL) reading services were offered to almost double the number of students which had been served the previous year, and there was a corresponding expansion in the number of schools offering the labs. An elementary math lab was offered for the first time to one school in 1976-77 as an experiment in the use of two pull-out programs (reading and math) in the same school. This practice was discontinued in 1977-78 because of scheduling problems for teachers.

The reaction to the Demonstration among parents continued to be positive in 1976-77. There was some improvement in parent participation in the district and in local PACs which, according to parent interviews, stemmed in part from having a greater number of children involved in the program.

DISTRICT SUMMARY, 1976-77:

Yonkers

In 1976-77 the Yonkers school district continued to determine eligibility of schools for Title I funds according to poverty criteria. As part of the Demonstration, however, four of the nine schools targeted for services were designated as Demonstration schools in which whole classes received compensatory instruction. By serving the entire populations of these schools, Yonkers hoped to improve efficiency of program delivery and eliminate the stigma associated with pull-out compensatory instruction. The goals of the Yonkers program included: coordination of lab and classroom instruction; teacher training to improve the individualized instruction of Title I participants; and parent workshops whose primary purpose was to teach parents to assist children with their homework.

While reducing expenditures for elementary instruction somewhat, Yonkers increased the number of students receiving elementary instruction by 83%. No details concerning how this change was accomplished were available at the time of writing.

The Demonstration has been affected by the district's ongoing fiscal difficulties. Immediately prior to the Demonstration, the city was on the brink of default. During that time the school budget was cut back by $9 million, some 400 professionals and teachers were terminated, and one-half of the system's regular employees left for one reason or another. Also, seven schools were closed, including three Title I schools.